

Theris
4152

**TEACHER/THERAPIST COLLABORATIONS: DISCOURSES,
POSITIONINGS AND POWER RELATIONS AT WORK**

**Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education of the University of Stirling**

JOAN CHRISTINE FORBES

Institute of Education

October 2003

09/04

ABSTRACT

The focus of this research is on the collaboration relationships of teachers and therapists working in school-based provision for pupils with language and communication disorders. The research is concerned with how the collaboration relationship operates as a power relation for these individuals. There is an attempt to work out something of the effects of changing notions of professionalism in its historical and current versions. The research reveals individuals' identifications with the powerful discourses in this contingent context, manifested in their metaphors and discursive moves. It analyses the complex interaction of discourses and cultural discourses/practices, attempting to grasp the effects of the powerful discourses as individuals construct and re-construct multiple professional and cultural identities and subject positions. In its examination of the political and cultural functioning of the forces of power-knowledge-selves-desire, the research analyses the operation of five dimensions of power at work in these relationships. The analysis subsequently suggests some implications for teacher/therapist co-practice.

The research attends to the discourses of inter-professional collaboration in government policy documentation at the macro level, within local authority and school-institution policy statements at the meso level and in the way that participants write and speak of their collaborations at a micro level. Macro level discourses were examined in the relevant speech and language therapy and education agencies' policy documentation including Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Schools (HMI) Report (1996) and the Royal

College of Speech and Language Therapists (RCSLT) (1996) statement of professional standards. Meso level discourses were sought in the relevant local education authority and school policy documentation. Micro level discourses were explored in instances of individuals' talk about their collaborative practice. Participants' accounts were gathered in semi-structured interviews, audiotaped collaborators' meeting talk and written texts.

Individual experiences within specific collaboration relationships have not perhaps been grasped or understood in research into teacher/therapist co-working which draws upon positivist methodology and uses positivist methods. There is much previous research which theorizes collaboration at interagency or interprofessional levels or that takes a systems theory approach that seeks to generalize norms of 'effectiveness' at either or both of these levels. This research was concerned to explore individuals' experiences of co-practice in an analysis which questioned co-practice norms and attempted to unsettle certainties. Participants' accounts in this analysis suggested a more continuous, fluid process of construction and re-construction of individuals' subject positions characterised by unstable identifications. Analysis of individuals' accounts revealed their subjection to the powerful discourses and their active exploitations of those discourses as resources, their subject positions manifested in their discursive choices, ambivalences, oscillations, evasions and miscalculations. Certain of the ways were uncovered in which multiple, unstable practice and co-practice related discourses interplay and compete, working to produce individuals subject to their power; and providing the discursive resources which individuals deploy as they constitute and re-constitute discourse/practice identity positions in their struggles for domination within

their relationships. This analysis suggests certain of the effects of the powerful discourses as the participants constitute and re-constitute acceptable power sharing practices, positions within the dimensions of power which, at times collide with positions acceptable to the other.

A number of possibilities for the co-practice of teachers and therapists in school-site provision for pupils with language and communication disorders are identified and discussed. These suggest how school institutions' and agencies' policy makers might attend to the diversity and plurality of teachers' and therapists' discursive resources and co-practices. These also suggest that spaces for the exploration of teacher/therapist discourse/practice differences as these relate to the notion of shared discursive resources and co-practice should be opened-up. These further suggest the need to question current policies and practices using a wider variety of conceptual and analytical tools and the need for shared learning spaces which might promote more personally acceptable practices underpinned by knowledge of each other's aspirations.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I thank the teachers and therapists who participated in this research for their enthusiasm for the project and their generosity in sharing their time and talk with me.

I also warmly thank Professor Julie Allan, my supervisor, for her advice, encouragement, good humour and support.

Finally, with much love, I thank Ian and Ben for, as always, being here, there and everywhere for me. Thank you both for everything.

CONTENTS

Abstract

Acknowledgements

Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Outline of the dissertation	5
Chapter 2: New research traditions: methodological decisions	7
Lyotard's intellectual tools	11
Derrida's critical tools	12
Foucault's analytical tools	18
Chapter 3a: Methodology	29
Aims of the research	29
Overall research question	29
Research sub questions	29
The research approach	30
Introducing the metaphors which operate to constitute the concrete power relation	32
Research methods	40
Regarding reflexivity	45
Seeking a reliable, stable foundation for the empirical work	48
Seeking texts that manifested the therapist/teacher power struggles	49
Ethical decisions	51
Standards of judgement	55

	Frameworks and methods for analysis	57
	Introducing my positional voice and perspectival thinking	58
	Power dimensions in the move to collaboration	61
	Rethinking my overall research problem	66
Chapter 3b	Methodological decisions: chronological signposts	67
Chapter 4:	What's been written: the discursive effects	83
	Why critique mainly school policy?	83
	Collaboration: the focus of this research	85
	Outline of this chapter	87
	A view of 'discourse'	87
	Strand 1: policy documentation discourses	89
	Prevailing collaboration policy discourses	94
	Policy implementation strategy	98
	The effects of official statements	99
	Accommodating change	101
	Strand 2: new conceptualizations of 'professional'	103
	'Profession' and its related concepts	105
	New norms of professionalism	106
	The new view of collaborative professionalism	108
	Strand 3: collaboration	109
	Collaboration metaphors	117
	Grappling with collaboration: using metaphor as a tool	121
Chapter 5:	Getting to know them: the research sites and participants	125

	The participants introduce themselves and their settings	131
	Benian Primary School Special Educational Needs Base...	131
	Glenian Primary School provision...	133
	Inverian Primary School Language Unit	137
Chapter 6:	The way we were: cellular classrooms, clinics and collaboration	141
Chapter 7:	A self-critical eye on my previous attempts at analysis	150
	What did I do and learn in the second attempt at analysis?	154
Chapter 8:	The empirical material: strategies and selections	168
	The analysis: selection of texts from the empirical material gathered	174
Chapter 9:	The metaphors: positions constructed with/in the discourses	177
	The metaphors and how they are deployed in the Benian meeting	182
	The metaphors and how they are deployed in the Glenian meeting	193
	The metaphors and how they are deployed in the Inverian meeting	210
Chapter 10:	Power relations in the collaborations	231
	Foucault's tools for analyzing power relations	234
	Applying the power dimensions' analytical framework	236
	Slipping into something more comfortable: what does this analysis suggest?	255

Chapter 11: When all is said and done: some possibilities	258
How, specifically, might these suggestions be put to work?	263
The space for endings...when all is said and done...	270
References	

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The focus for this research is on teachers and speech and language therapists (SLTs) collaborating in school-based language support provision. This research explores the ways in which the notion of 'collaboration' between teachers and therapists has been and is spoken about. It seeks to understand the diversity in the different lived realities of collaborations in-practice in the cultural contexts of teachers and SLTs working together to support children with language and communication disorders. Teachers and therapists have recently been challenged by the possibilities and conflicts amongst the potential new identities for their selves created by recent policies that recommend new professional responsibilities, powers and practices for their joint work. There are seven participants in this research and it is their accounts collected in their provision meetings which are analysed here. The teachers' and therapists' accounts are not read in order to find a single ultimate 'objective' truth or essence of what collaboration is but rather to explore some of the effects of the power relations in collaboration practices in these practitioners' contexts.

In order to develop the conceptual and theoretical framework required to undertake the planned scrutiny of collaboration power relations in participants' accounts, I review and critique some of the discursive formations around collaboration in policy statements and in changing views of 'the professional' and its related terms. The analysis utilizes some of Lyotard's, Derrida's and Foucault's critical and analytical tools. An analysis of

the authoritative policy discourses and the diversity of the competing discourses and discursive formations around interprofessional collaborative practices is attempted. This analysis opens up a discursive space in which to examine notions of the 'professional' and of professional boundaries; and to attend to the beliefs and assumptions underpinning those discursive formations which legitimize or prohibit particular practices in collaboration relationships.

New and particular discourses which aspire to 'government' (Foucault in Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982, 221), in Foucault's terms 'to structure the possible field of action' (ibid. 221), of teacher/therapist collaboration were deployed in the Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists (RCSLT) (1996) and Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Schools (HMI) (1996) policy documentation. This research is concerned to examine the ways in which the discourses of 'interprofessional collaboration' and its associated terms have been deployed at different times in policy and the governmental effects of application of that particular label on practices. I critique the documentation and unpick some of the effects of the discourses of 'professionalism' and 'collaboration'. I explore, in participants' deployment of particular metaphors and discourses, individuals' compliances, contestations which signal their self-subjectifications and cultural aspirations in relation to notions of disciplinary based professionalism and of practitioner collaboration. I analyse the challenges to individuals' professional and disciplinary identities which might be signified in the functioning of the dimensions of power in these collaboration relations.

Consideration of the tensions and interplay between the discourses around conceptualizations of the professional was undertaken in the empirical work which sought to explore the reality of the diversity and hybridity of interprofessional collaboration-in-practice in different school-based contexts. I explore the effects of interprofessional collaboration discourses, what interprofessional collaborative practice choices and desires participants speak of and what teacher/therapist collaboration discourses do. In exploring participants' accounts, I am interested in the discursive positions they each take up. I uncover something of their 'agonism' (Foucault in Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982, 222), their struggles, acceptances or resistances, of the discourses. Drawing upon Foucault's (1972) work on the rules of exclusion and division that operate in discourses, I examine how these individuals' discourses are tied to desire and power.

This work and text foregrounds that Foucauldian 'ethical' question of the individual's role and activity in research. My own 'conditions of life and work and real, material, everyday struggles' (Foucault in Gordon, 1980, 126) have situated me as a worker engaged with the struggles that are explored here. I am aware that I operate here in my local, specific area of competence in ways suggested by Simons (1995), 'vested with a certain responsibility and power on the basis of close association with true discourses (as their producer, consumer or distributor)' (91) of the teacher/therapist collaboration discourses. It is as such, that I attempted to develop an analysis that explored the detail of the reality of participants' present professional boundaries or limits and of the ways

in which putative 'changing practices' work to transgress limits and dissolve previous practice boundaries.

This analysis explores what is at stake for individual teachers and therapists in doing collaboration. I will examine the ways in which diverse and hybrid forms of collaboration emerge and illustrate various stages of in-between-ness. I explore certain gaps and contradictions in prevailing ideas and concepts of 'collaboration'. Derrida (in Cahoon, 2003) asserts that:

the signified concept is never present in itself, in an adequate presence that would refer only to itself. Every concept is necessarily inscribed in a chain or system, within which it refers to another and to other concepts (230).

Such an assertion would suggest that different meanings underlie the same term or 'signifier' (Derrida, 1981a, 8) and that any singular grasp of a signifier, for example 'collaboration', is always deferred. It further suggests that gaps omissions and exclusions always appear when we try to explain a signifier such as 'collaboration' which 'ties together a configuration of concepts' (ibid. 8). In keeping with Foucault's detailed historical studies which analyse 'the disunity of concepts within history' (Bouchard, 1977, 20), the strategy in this work is to:

take seriously what ... discourses were trying to do, that we attend to the features that distinguish these discourses from each other and from our own (Shumway, 1989, 21).

In this dissertation I build a text, a collage concerning collaboration, while seeking to remain 'reflexively' (see, for example, Alvesson and Skoldberg, 2000) aware - 'self-on-self' - of my thinking, as producer of this work. In the space of a series of reflexive asides concerning current aspects of the research, I produce 'fragments of an autobiography' which articulate the changes in my thinking and how I think about thinking and ways of 'doing knowledge' over the time of the research. My attention to reflexivity produced opportunities for re-thinking and questioning my own and others' normative judgements, 'truths' and 'realities' during this research. What follows is a 'simulacrum' (Baudrillard cited in Lather, 1991, 160 and Usher and Edwards, 1994, 14,) which stories the 'reality' of this research. Scheurich (1997) describes such a 'simulacral story' as 'a story of something that never existed' (1).

Outline of the dissertation

Here, I provide an outline of the structure of the dissertation. Chapter 2 explores some of the analytical tools drawn from the new research traditions which are used in this dissertation, in particular, the intellectual tools of Lyotard, the critical tools of Derrida and the analytical tools of Foucault are introduced. Chapter 3a introduces the methodology, including the research questions, strategy, and frameworks and methods for analysis. Chapter 3b addresses my methodological decision making and practices

and provides some chronological signposts for the reader. In chapter 4 the literature's discursive effects are reviewed within three strands: the policy framework, notions of 'professional' and its related terms, and the concept of collaboration. I introduce the research sites and participants in chapter 5. Chapter 6 is an analysis of participants' accounts of the ways in which, in particular historical contexts, teachers and therapists performed collaboration. In a reflexive aside in chapter 7 I discuss my previous attempts to analyse the empirical material. In chapter 8 the analytical strategy of uncovering the metaphors operating in the empirical material is introduced. Chapter 9 introduces the metaphors and I discuss how they are deployed. In chapter 10 I use Foucault's tools for analysis of the power relations in the discourses as they operate in these specific cultural contexts. Instances of power imbalances and power sharing are analysed and the possible implications are discussed. The final chapter of the dissertation, chapter 11, 'When all is said and done', makes some suggestions about ways of overcoming power imbalances and developing collaborative relations to the other, in which account is taken of each individual's aspirations and self-subjectifications.

CHAPTER 2

NEW RESEARCH TRADITIONS: METHODOLOGICAL DECISIONS

This research was not concerned to seek the 'objective truths' or ideal forms of interprofessional collaboration; rather, it examined how notions of 'interprofessional collaboration' have been constructed, valued and deployed at different times and the effects of the application of the label 'collaboration' to practices. I critically analysed the introduction of the notion of collaboration into this social and cultural context and explored how participant teachers and therapists impose particular versions and possibilities of collaboration on themselves and on their partner in the collaboration relationship. I analysed empirical material gathered from six teachers and therapists, attending to participants' discourses constituting their beliefs and assumptions of the 'realities' of interprofessional collaboration.

In these initial attempts at analysis, I sought 'collaboration' in participants' written and interview accounts. I assumed that what individuals said about collaboration would constitute the 'realities' of their collaboration. Subsequently, I became aware of the inadequacies of seeking to grasp the struggles operating in specific collaboration relationships, the power relations in-action, in what individuals separately said about them. Analyzing nursing research on 'caring', Paley (2001, 2002) asserts that the kind of knowledge which much of current nursing research produces about 'caring' is of the 'things said' about caring, 'essentially...caring-at-one-remove' (2001, 190). Paley argues that such an approach in which: 'knowledge of caring is an aggregate of things said

about it' (2001, 188) is 'plethoric yet absolutely poverty-stricken' (ibid. 188). I became aware of tensions in my position in this research, for example, I did not seek to produce essentializing and reductive lists of what collaboration is, but the first question that I asked of each participant was: *Can you tell me what you understand by collaboration?* I became aware that my interview questions prompted interviewees to speak of the 'attributes' of collaboration (Paley, ibid. 190). I discuss my use of interviews for data gathering further in chapter 3a. In chapter 7, I reflexively re-view my initial attempts to analyse participants' written texts and interview accounts in terms of the themes and categories spoken in policies' discourses.

As my thinking shifted in this work, I sought approaches to data gathering which were fitted to the aims in this research of exploring how participant teachers and therapists impose particular versions and possibilities of collaboration on themselves and on their partner in their collaboration relationships in-action. I sought ways to uncover the functioning of the power relations in these individuals' collaboration relationships. I analysed these specific collaboration relations, entangled in all sorts of ways between the power dimensions of 'initiation, benefits, representation, legitimation and accountability' (Bishop and Glynn, 1999, 54). I sought, through the empirical work, a better understanding of how individual participants actually conceive of themselves and their collaborative behaviour.

The conceptual and theoretical framework that underpins the research drew on notions about discourse and metaphor using the analytical toolkits of Lyotard, Derrida and

Foucault. Foucault's conceptual tools provided multiple sights from which to examine the power/knowledge at work in discourses. In keeping with a research perspective located after the 'postmodern turn' (Hassan, 1987, title page) attention was paid to reflexivity and this is written into the text. I did not seek a 'reality out there', knowable through the 'objective', 'rational' norms and techniques of scientificist research. The assumptions of Western metaphysics and the beliefs and practices of the positivist research tradition have increasingly been questioned and displaced. One example of this is the calling to question of the belief that logic, objectivity and neutrality guarantee authoritative and legitimate knowledge of ultimate reality. In another example, the belief that true knowledge is comprehensively explained in central and unchanging meta-narratives such as those of Christian doctrine or Marxism has been displaced. Knowledge is increasingly seen as contested, constructed from many standpoints by many voices (Foucault 1972, 1973, 1977, Foucault in Gordon, 1980, Derrida, 1981a, Foucault in Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982, Lyotard, 1984, Lather, 1991).

In the following chapters, arguments are made for an analysis which uses an exploration of the metaphor in participants' accounts to produce a critique of power in these particular contexts. Such an analysis borrows from Derrida's view of the way 'truth effects' are produced in language and discourse by means of metaphor and from Nietzsche's view of 'objective truth as a fiction, a will-o-the-wisp, a human pretension' (Novak, 2001, 10-11) which is produced through language and metaphor. Foucault's work on truth and power provided intellectual tools for this dissertation. Foucault (2000a, 2000b, 2000c) denies the progress of 'objective knowledge' about human

beings or of scientific knowledge that centralizes and essentializes the figure of Man.

Foucault, according to Simons (1995),

does not consider the truths of the human sciences to be lies. ... there are truths that correlate with modes of government...of domains, or 'regimes of truth' (44; original emphasis).

After encountering Derrida's thinking, I had come to view 'knowledge' as the sign/signifier for a signified that is an always unstable notion. Accepting the 'fundamental plurality and uncertainty of meaning' (Cahoone, 2003, 225), I had stopped searching for what knowledge is; rather, I sought to explore the effects of the operation of the rules of particular power/knowledge games. Reading the analyses of Foucault (1972, 1973, 1977 and in Gordon 1980) of the apparatuses and effects of power/knowledge, I began to question how the referent 'knowledge' was made use of tactically - whose knowledge? - valued how? - used for what purposes?

This research story does not seek to be judged by the standards, myths or 'masks' of validity valorized and distributed in the discourses of the human sciences and social sciences. My assumption in this account was that knowledge is subjective, that is, positional, partial, provisional and always subject to review and revision.

In what follows, I focus on the value of Lyotard's and Derrida's intellectual tools in my analysis. The relevance and applicability of certain of Foucault's analytical tools in this analysis is then discussed.

Lyotard's intellectual tools

How did I make use of the work of Lyotard? Reading Lyotard (1984) at the beginning of this work opened up a questioning of the previously unquestioned grand narratives of science and progress and of the legitimacy of the existing totalizing and unifying rules of scientific inquiry, science's 'language games' (1984, 10) that proved and guaranteed knowledge. Lyotard's thinking, for example, that knowledge is fragmented and provisional, provided a new take on the rules and categories that have governed the fixed, stable and central timeless essences of 'reality' and 'identity' (1984,75). Lyotard's work together with my subsequent reading of Derrida and Foucault, provided openings to constantly question, critique and re-think my previous beliefs and values.

The assumption underpinning this research is that reality is a text, subject to multiple readings and multiple uses. Lyotard (1984) asserts that in the condition of post-modernity meta-narratives are replaced by multiple mini-narratives, a plurality of stories that are characterized by very modest claims, none of them claiming to be ultimately true. In 'the postmodern', the criteria influencing individual choice to identify with a particular story are not those of truth or falsehood but those of instinct, preference or desire (see, for example, Bauman, 1992 and Zurbrugg, 1993). In theorizing the breaking up of the grand narratives, Lyotard offers analysis concerning

the move from 'the old poles of attraction' (1984, 15); one of which he suggests is the 'professions', (ibid. 15). Lyotard's turn to pragmatics suggests that individual selves are located in 'language games' and that these 'language games are the minimum relation required for society to exist' (ibid. 15). This perspective informed the present analysis which is concerned with emergence of a new social partner and new positioning of selves within the possibilities and limits of the language games of school institutions.

Lyotard's (1984) analysis of transformations in the nature, circulation and exchange of knowledge as an information commodity provided conceptual tools to rethink the work relations of the participants in this research. The exploration in this study of a particular contemporary work relationship in a context of changing service user demands of teachers and therapists and in a time of rapidly changing knowledge bases and of an information and technological explosion is informed by Lyotard's discussion of these matters.

Derrida's critical tools

How did I make use of the work of Derrida? From Derrida's thinking (1981a, 1981b, 2001, and in Cahoone, 2003) I learned to attempt to shift from my hitherto central thinking and to complicate previously unproblematically taken-for-granted notions. Reading Derrida and applications of Derridean thinking, (in Powell, 1997, Wolfreys, 1998, Biesta and Egea-Kuhne, 2001, Cahoone, 2003) I began to re-think my previous beliefs concerning truth, essence, unities and totalities, the idea of an origin and a centre, an ideal form, the centrality of God, Presence and the everlasting. I drew upon

Derrida's re-thinking of what he terms 'logocentrism', Western metaphysic's philosophy of Presence, that 'being' is present and further, that Truth is present in the word in spoken language. Hall (2003) argues that:

The logocentric bias of Western philosophy motivates thinkers to attempt to present the truth, being, essence or logical structure of that about which they think or discourse (512).

Derrida's refusal to seek order and structure in things; rather, to be concerned with difference and otherness, was an important conceptual tool in this research. This work draws upon Derrida's position that words do not point to some ultimate reality beyond themselves; what they do is refer to other words in a web of language. Derrida refuses metaphysic's theme of 'the direct grasp of the signified' (Houdebine in Derrida 1981a, 79). Derrida asserts that the 'signifier' never arrives at a stable 'signified'. He deploys the term 'différance' to signal 'a recognition of this fundamental plurality and uncertainty of meaning' (in Cahoone, 2003, 225). Borrowing from Derrida's positions, I explored the play of motifs of collaboration in participants' accounts. In the analysis below, I sought and examined participants' metaphors as the devices which construct the collaborative relationship. Reading their accounts, I looked for these participants' metaphors of collaboration, how they think collaboration, rather than seeking any single, central, logical and univocal meaning for the notion of collaboration. Exploring how language, the controlling notions, metaphors and categories of discourse, produce, delimit and exclude the possible constitution of concepts, I examined how certain forms

of collaboration are performed and produced and others are silenced. I sought to uncover how prevailing discursive conditions make certain forms of collaboration possible and legitimate and function to marginalize and exclude counter-discourses. In seeking the metaphors, the figurative meanings, at work in the collaborative relationships, I rejected the notion of a single given of collaboration; rather, I sought to bring into question how collaboration is constituted in language (Levinas, 2003) and how particular metaphors and norms structure and control present legitimizations of collaboration (West, 2003). In this work I was concerned with how participants' language and metaphor operate, how language speaks and manoeuvres. Participants' texts are not used as 'central' but are viewed as 'part of a vast intertextual field' (Ward, 1997, 164) constituting collaboration.

Derrida questions the foundations of the tradition of Western metaphysics and the particular relation to the world which it institutes through its notions of central ideas. For Derrida, the notion of 'the central' produces the marginal other, 'the binary oppositions of metaphysics' (1981a, 41). For example, if Man is valued, and privileged as central, woman is made marginal, other and lacking (see, for example, St Pierre and Pillow, 2000, Quinn, 2003, Irigary, 2003, Bordo in Cahoone, 2003). Reading the analysis of Levinas (in Cahoone, 2003) of the ethical construction of other compelled me to critique my previous thinking which attempted to 'reabsorb every Other into the Same and neutralize alterity' (530). Satterthwaite (2003) summarizes Levinas's ideas thus:

Levinas is telling us...that what matters is other people. Studying something (such as the being of another person) misses the point...because what matters is people, ethics takes priority over ontology - we consider primarily what we should do rather than what may or may not be. ...I am what I am by virtue of my being confronted by the Other. (115).

My reading of Satterthwaite's critique of Levinas's position on the notion of other had resonance with my reading of Foucault's notions of 'governmentality' and of 'historical contingencies' (discussed further below), of not asking 'what?' and 'why?' but 'how?' and 'by what means?' -crucially, 'by what ethico-political means?' Such readings, together with learning from Derrida's positions, shifted my thinking from an identity position privileging ideas of the central sovereign subject.

From my reading of Derrida, I re-thought my previous thinking that attempted to fix or freeze the play of 'binary opposites' in a constant and unchanging power relation of dominance and subjection. I deployed that new conceptual tool in this analysis of the play, between-ness or undecidabilities in the power relationships between teacher/therapist pairs. Derrida, like Lyotard and Foucault, suggests a new political and ethical turn in relation to knowledge. Derrida suggests a new practice of 'deconstruction' that decentres, takes apart and critiques the underlying central assumptions of systems of knowledge. This resonates with Lyotard's vision of knowledge as a search for 'instabilities' (Jameson, foreword in Lyotard, 1984, xix), and with Foucault's analyses of the history of the systems of thought. The Derridean notion

of 'deconstruction', concerned how the text unravels itself through discursive ploys, is complex, encompassing a variety of turns. Cahen (2001) stresses deconstruction's positive ethical turn:

to deconstruct is first and foremost to undo a construction with infinite patience, to take apart a system in order to understand all its mechanisms, to exhibit all its foundations, and to reconstruct it on new bases. (13).

Derrida's assertions which privilege new forms of theory and practice concerning knowledge, in particular in relation to notions of writing, the text and the subject have, together with Lyotard's intellectual tools and Foucault's analytical tools, informed the conceptual and theoretical framework of my research.

The writing turn

The turn to writing is part of the wider 'linguistic turn' (Rorty, 1967, title) or a concern to explore the language of representation of objects or referents. Derrida's analyses undermined metaphysics' assumptions of the privileging of speech over writing.

Derrida sought to dispel philosophical ideas about thinkers' and speakers' presence in, and intentional control of, their logical argument. Potter (1996) argues that for Derrida, speakers draw upon and use cultural systems of discourse made up amongst other things by metaphors. Through his genealogical analyses of the historical and cultural constructions of concepts, Derrida affirms the practice of ethical and political work

which constructs something new and other for the future (see for example, Biesta and Egea-Kuehne, 2001).

Foucault characterizes intellectual writing as a transgressive practice with the potential to enable the individual to think in other ways, providing one form of intellectual and practical work on limits. Simons (1995) suggests that intellectual writing constitutes a Foucauldian transgressive practice or 'art of the self' (see, for example, Foucault in Rabinow, 2000, 261-262). Simons (1995) and Barker (1998) argue that for Foucault, writing is the specific practice, more so even than reflection, that enables us to explicate the assumptions which underpin our practices and thought and to re-think them. Foucault (in Kritzman, 1988) suggests that it is the kind of change and self-transformation which is brought about by writing which changes and alters the things he thinks and articulates his intellectual positions, over time.

The move from the sovereign subject

Derrida (in Biesta and Egea-Kuehne, 2001) discusses what deconstructing the Western metaphysical concept of 'the subject' means. For Derrida, deconstructing the Cartesian 'subject' is an attempt to analyse the assumptions in the layers of the history of that concept. Such a deconstruction opens up to scrutiny the underlying assumptions of the liberal humanist tradition's formation, development, legitimization and use of the concept of the autonomous sovereign subject as the centre of an identity and the subject of a life. Foucault is consistently concerned with opposition to the assumptions implicit in humanism. For example, Foucault (in Kritzman, 1988) asserts:

I do indeed believe that there is no sovereign, founding subject, a universal form of the subject ... I believe, on the contrary, that the subject is constituted through practices of subjection, or, ... through practices of liberation, of liberty, ... on the basis, ... of a number of rules, styles, inventions to be found in the cultural environment (50-51).

Foucault (in Bouchard, 1977) proposes the possibility of individuals' continuous transformation, in part by destruction of the humanist, pseudosovereign subject. Foucault argues against metaphysical attempts to unify or synthesize identity. He proposes that the will to knowledge and self-experimentation dissolves the unity of the subject and produces choice and plurality in identities. Dreyfus and Rabinow (1982) point out that in Foucault's genealogical analyses the 'universal' concepts of humanism are viewed as the products of human interpretations. These were valuable intellectual tools in the present questioning, a 'discontinuous, particular and local criticism' (Foucault in Gordon, 1980, 80), that grapples with the ways in which the effects of different discourses constitute the working practice experiences of teachers and therapists.

Foucault's analytical tools

How did I make use of the work of Foucault? The 'box of tools' (Deleuze in Bouchard, 1977, 208) provided by Michel Foucault may be used to pose a different set of questions about the discourses concerning teacher/therapist work. Baggini and Fosl

(2003) argue that Foucault provides 'tools for radical critique' (184) which offer us 'a number of powerful additions to our toolkit' (ibid. 184). For example, when assessing the research practices which are taken seriously and dominate in the field of collaboration, I seek to know 'what power games might be lurking there' (ibid. 184). Foucault (in Bouchard, 1977) asserts that 'theory does not express practice: it is practice' (208). Foucault's detailed historical analyses (1972, 1973, 1977) which constitute certain truth claims as 'discursive effects', illustrate how beliefs develop in ways that are arbitrary and are always related to social power/knowledge structures.

Foucault's notion of 'governmentality' (in Bertani and Fontana, 2003, 284, and cited in Danaher, Shirato and Webb, 2000) that 'the ways in which we perform [for example, collaboration] are established by dominant discourses' (Danaher, Shirato and Webb, ibid. 135; my parenthesis), offered a fruitful tool in this work. Foucault (cited in Hursh, 2003) constitutes 'governmentality' as:

[t]he ensemble formed by the institutions, procedures, analysis, and reflections, the calculations and tactics that allow the exercise of this very specific albeit complex form of power (46).

My approach to analysis was shifted by Foucault's notion of governmentality in the ways suggested by Rose (cited in Hursh, ibid.):

Away from 'what happened and why?' to 'asking what authorities of various sorts wanted to happen, in relation to problems defined how, in pursuit of what objectives, through what strategies and techniques?' (46).

In the analysis which follows, I was interested in uncovering the system by which the authorities in the setting sought, at a distance, to govern, control and discipline the collaboration relation of therapists and teachers working in school sites. I hoped, too, to reveal how teachers and therapists are subject to the discourses, controlled at a distance by the power of the discourses. My analysis was not concerned with notions of an instrumental compliance-resistance binary. I sought the ambiguities and oscillations in individuals' identifications, self-subjectifications and subject self-positionings. I also sought to uncover how, in their agonistic struggles in their work sites, they actively use the discourses to construct new hybrid discourses and identity positions in the personally and professionally new and uncertain space of collaboration.

Foucault's analyses contested the classical sovereign-subject, 'sovereignty-obedience' (in Gordon, 1980, 96) model of the mechanisms of power. He challenged, too, the negative philosophy of sovereignty and of sovereign feudal and legal power which underpins classical theories of power (see, for example, Foucault in Gordon, 1980 and Foucault in Bertani and Fontana, 2003). Foucault asserted that power must be analysed as positive, a technology of tactics and strategies:

something which circulates...is employed and exercised through a net-like organisation. ...individuals ... are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power (in Gordon, 1980, 98).

Foucault suggested that it is through power that individuals are subjected to the production of truth and that individuals 'cannot exercise power except through the production of truth' (ibid. 93). Foucault's analyses of power and truth substitute 'the problem of domination and subjection for that of sovereignty and obedience' (ibid. 96).

Foucault's figure of domination-subjection relations of power between individuals is borrowed and applied as an analytical tool in the examination in chapter 10 of the particular dominances and subjections at work in the participant teachers' and therapists' collaboration relationships. The analysis in chapter 10 examines the technology of tactics and strategies at work in certain of the dimensions of power and how specific forms of individual and professional power/knowledge operate and perhaps interlock as collaboration in these participants' specific contexts.

The analytical tools provided in the work of Michel Foucault may be used to pose a different set of questions about the 'things said' about teacher/therapist work that grapple with questions of how individuals' self-formation is tied to 'knowledge-power-liberty' (Bernauer, 1990, 4). For example, Foucault (1972) speaks of:

no longer-treating discourses as groups of signs ... but as practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak (49).

Foucault (1985, 1986, cited in Faubion 2000, cited in Rabinow 2000) asserts the ethical principle of freedom to question the self-evidence of knowledge and power. This analysis attempts to explore the influences and structures that contribute to the conditions of possibility for the emergence and developments in the practices of 'collaboration' between teachers and speech and language therapists.

Foucault's 'skeptical' (Rajchman, 1985, 3) and detailed historical analyses which questioned the truth claims of particular modern meta-narratives as discursive effects illustrated how those grand beliefs developed in ways that were arbitrary and always related to psychological, social, political and economic knowledge/power structures. In particular, Foucault's analyses encourage us to 'identify the accidents... and the faulty calculations' (Foucault cited in Bouchard, 1977, 146) which lead us to choose this particular practice and policy discourse's 'truth' rather than the 'truth' of another discourse.

Foucault included discourses in a wider 'ensemble' (Foucault in Gordon 1980, 194) of elements comprising:

discourses, institutions, architectural forms, regulatory decisions, laws, administrative measures, scientific statements, philosophical, moral and philanthropic propositions (ibid. 194).

Foucault (1977) spoke of the formation, nature or system of connections and relations amongst these elements as 'the apparatus'. The notion of the apparatus of collaboration was a conceptual tool used in this analysis of the differences, shifts and modifications in the formations of collaboration in scientific research statements, policy, government documentation statements, different school institutions and in participants' discourses.

This research was an attempt to grasp something of the societal and political developments behind the policy and other technologies of the apparatus of collaboration. Grappling with collaboration in this way opened up a space to question the 'disciplinary power' (Foucault, 1977, 156) that 'makes individuals' (ibid. 170) as collaborators and to examine the technologies of collaboration which, Bernauer (1990) asserts, 'shape our experience of our very selves and our questioning of that experience' (4). This work was a questioning of the history of the discourses/practices concerning the teacher/therapist collaboration relationship and not an attempt to establish blueprints for practice, ideal forms of practice or to formulate prescriptions concerning policy and practice. This research assumed that knowledge and power are interrelated, that power/knowledge operate through discourses and practices, that individuals are constructed by relations of power/knowledge exercised over their bodies (Foucault in Gordon, 1980 and see, for example, Donzelot, 1997 and Donald, 1992) and that

individuals can and do resist the effects of power/knowledge. It assumed too that individual selves are written by multiple and plural roles and images and that individuals present different selves in different contexts. The research sought to explore individuals' subjectivizations in collaboration relations.

Foucault's work drew much upon spatial metaphorizations to explore power/knowledge and the relations that are possible between them (1977). His analyses of knowledge in terms of the processes by which 'knowledge functions as a form of power; and disseminates the effects of power' (Foucault in Gordon, 1980, 69) were borrowed in this analysis of particular forms and administrations, politics and micro-politics of collaboration power/knowledge. This analysis considered the relations of power which circulate and pass through collaboration power/knowledge. I attempted to explore the forms of domination operating in the empirical data signalled by talk of, for example, 'fields' of knowledge, 'places' of practice or professional 'territories'.

In his analyses, Foucault re-thought the notion of power in terms of a technology of power, tactics and strategies of power in particular institutional spaces providing the figure of a spatializing, observing disciplinary power (1977). I borrowed Foucault's notions of bodily spatializations and of disciplinary power's function of 'dressage' (ibid. 136) in this analysis. I sought to explore the dimensions of power that operate in joint-working relationships between individuals whose 'docile bodies' (ibid. 135) have previously been subject to different specific 'hierarchical observation' (ibid. 170), 'normalizing judgements' (ibid. 177) and 'the examination' (ibid. 184) through their

different 'professional' education and work dressage. These practices are examples of what Foucault speaks of as 'operating the division' (ibid. 183). Danaher, Shirato and Webb (2000) assert that dividing practices are the processes used:

throughout the social body ...distinguishing people on the basis of their perceived normality...Dividing practices operate throughout various social institutions...Dividing practices work to qualify or disqualify people as fit and proper members of the social order (60-61).

The operation of the norms, or dividing practices, of professionalism and of collaboration were attended to in my analysis below. I was interested in how professional and collaborative norms establish central notions, standards and hallmarks, in relation to which individual practitioners take up a multiplicity of subject positions. I was also interested in how individuals actively identified with different norms of work practice and how these different subject positions were viewed. For example, were some of the positions which individuals took up considered by their co-workers to be dissident or deficient, in some ways different to the norms of policy?

Foucault (in Bouchard, 1977) speaks of what transgression does and how it is implicated in individuals' work on themselves to think and be in other ways and to take on new forms of subjectivity. In the transgression of limits, Foucault seeks 'to give new impetus to ...the undefined work of freedom' (Foucault in Rabinow, 1984, 46).

Foucault suggests that 'transgression is an action which involves the limit' (Foucault in

Bouchard, 1977, 33). Foucault asserts that transgression is not a once-and-for-all transcendence of limits; rather, it is an on-going practice:

Transgression ...is not related to the limit as black to white, the prohibited to the lawful, the outside to the inside, or as the open area of a building to its enclosed spaces. Rather their relationship takes the form of a spiral which no simple infraction can exhaust (ibid. 35).

Allan (1999) suggests that 'most importantly, transgression involves the challenging or crossing of limits or boundaries imposed by others' (47).

The notion of transgression as constant self-work to resist others' imposition of limits of power was used to explore these practitioners' transgressions of others' imposition of delimiting boundaries on their 'professional' practice. Foucault's analyses of the exercise of freedom in transgressive work on limits is not to be read as essentializing the 'truth' of a particular existing or new professional practice. Rather, as Simons (1995) suggests 'Foucault's work on transgression signifies work on enabling limits' (3). This work by the self on enabling limits can emerge from an acceptance of our indebtedness to boundaries that others imposed on us, the constraints that shape us and our lives. Acceptance of limits as possibilities provides a means to overcome any previous resentment of particular boundaries or limitations. Such an argument has resonance for the work in this dissertation in analysing the limits and possibilities in the collaboration

power relationship between teachers and therapists. Viewing limits as conditions of possibility, Simons further asserts that:

Limits are truly enabling when, having given something its form (such as the self) the form engages with its own limits to fashion its own style (ibid. 3)

What did I plan to look for in my research in relation to transgression? I sought to explore participants' transgressions of the limits of previous professional boundaries which had been imposed on them by others in their initial professional formation. I planned to examine how participants had taken these professional boundaries upon themselves in their practice and how these participants take on new forms of subjectivity in their specific collaboration relationships. For example, the intention was to uncover how participants work on themselves to think and be in other ways and to explore their collaboration styles. I examined the ways in which individuals, previously formed in particular ways as teacher and therapist individuals through knowledge, theory and practice, placed their professional selves and own bodies in and out of the collaborative relationship.

Reflexive aside: perhaps the opening of this kind of space for teacher and therapist practitioners to talk together and to write about their thinking about their collaboration work is of some worth in itself. Such discursive spaces might empower participants to reflexively consider how their collaboration

works and to sceptically question how decisions about what counts as effective collaboration practice are made. For example, practitioners might question whether measuring their practice against others' imposed boundaries of norms and truths or 'standards' or 'productiveness' is what really matters. People may consider whether there are there more important questions to be asked about how and why these indicators were produced as the 'objective' norms of practice.

CHAPTER 3a

METHODOLOGY

Aims of the research

In this work, I sought to critique the ways in which government policy documentation discourses legitimate particular collaboration relationships and working practice experiences for teachers and therapists. I also sought to collect and explore evidence in the accounts of individual teachers' and therapists' compliance, struggle or resistance within their particular collaboration power/knowledge relationship. In seeking to do the above I developed the following research question and sub questions.

Overall research question

What are the issues of power/knowledge for these teachers and therapists in their specific collaboration relationships?

Research sub questions

1. How do individual participant teachers and speech and language therapists construct notions of 'collaboration' within their interprofessional practice?
2. What conceptualization of collaboration with the other profession was current in policy and practice at the time of participants' initial professional education?
3. How do individual participants read the policy development concerning

'collaborative teamwork' in HMI report (1996): The Education of Pupils with Language and Communication Disorders?

4. How has the particular policy development re-framed macro and micro discourses of collaboration?
5. What do participants consider has been the impact on the practice of their professional group of the new conceptualization of collaborative teamwork framed in the particular policy development?
6. How do participants consider the conceptualizations of collaborative practice framed in the particular policy development have impacted to alter the culture in their provision?
7. What have been participants' individual responses to the particular policy development?
8. To what extent has individual selves' compliance, struggle or resistance had an impact on the policy implementation?

The research approach

These research questions were addressed in the context of three teacher and speech and language therapist collaborative professional pairs working within three language

support provision sites. In the case of one pair in Inverian Language Unit (pseudonyms are used throughout) the teacher's job-share partner also participated in the partnership meeting and contributed to the data gathered in that context. The authoritative characterizations of 'collaborative teamwork' are derived from the recommendations concerning teacher/therapist collaboration introduced in HMI report (1996) and the professional standards relating to collaboration introduced in RCSLT (1996). I attempted to read and analyse participants' texts without being technical and essentialist, for example, by looking for compliance with the norms of 'standards' or 'recommendations'. I sought instances of counter-discourses, contestations and in-betweennesses in relation to national, local authority and health board level and school and clinic level collaboration policy. I was interested in how participants might speak these macro, meso and micro discourses of collaboration separately in semi-structured interviews and together in provision meeting talk and how they might write about collaboration discourses in written texts. I did not systematically seek 'the presence' of these discourses at each of these levels. Throughout the research, I attempted to resist the essentializing imperative but my normative and essentializing impulses spoke out at times and I sought to remain reflexively aware of those moments.

This research was concerned with the matter of teacher/therapist collaboration as an instance of shifting power/knowledge relations in school-based provision. It was concerned with collaboration as an issue of power/knowledge. Given my concern for the relations between discourse and power, I used metaphor as an analytical tool to critique participants' texts concerning collaboration. I attempted initial analyses which

were unsatisfactory in a variety of respects which I discuss below. I found that I had gathered too much data for the purposes of this research. I also became aware that the data gathered in the semi-structured interviews and in the written assignment texts constituted rather bland 'seamless narratives' (Atkinson, 2003, 10). The interview and written narratives' 'smooth concord' (Bernauer, 1990, 91) shut down any talk of resistances that troubled their practices of collaboration. Participants in their 'smooth stories of the self' (MacLure, 1996, 283) carefully conformed to the discourses of collaboration legitimated in policy. Stories of uncertainty and hybridity complicating their collaboration relationships were concealed, forgotten or silenced in these tidy accounts. Were individuals practising self-surveillance, colluding to speak and write accounts of compliance with the values of collaboration? At that point, seeking difference, and seeking accounts of collaboration-in-action, I decided to analyse the partnership pairs' meeting talk in which participants actively engaged with each other. I considered that in these discursive conditions, struggling agonistically in collaboration relationships, individuals' contestations, counter-discourses and dissonances might irrupt.

Introducing the metaphors which operate to constitute the concrete power relation

In this analysis I drew upon the conceptual frame which Bishop and Glynn (1999) used in their examination of power relationships. Bishop and Glynn assert that five areas of activity should be examined: 'initiation, benefits, representation, legitimation and accountability' (ibid. 54). In this analysis I explored the things said about these dimensions of power in participants' metaphors, the devices which actually construct

the collaborative relationships' power relations. I analysed instances of metaphor around these five categories which were deployed by participants in the partnership pairs meetings. In so doing, I tried to unpick how these metaphors' specific configurations operate within discourses' 'rules of exclusion' (Foucault, 1972, 216) and 'division' (ibid. 216) to constitute the actual 'concrete power of the [collaboration] experience' (Bernauer, 1990, 88; my parenthesis).

I used some of Foucault's critical tools for examining the rites of exclusion and division operating in discourse and to explore and describe how the discourses in participants' talk were constructed and functioned, and their effects. In doing so I attempted, using Foucault, to free my thought, to 'think difference' (Bernauer, 1990, 91), to shift:

from a search for formal structures and place it [thought] in a historical field where it must confront the singular, contingent and arbitrary that operate in what is put forward as universal, necessary, and obligatory (ibid. 1990, 19).

I sought to uncover some of the factors that account for the differences between the actuality of the collaboration relationships examined here and the possibilities for teacher/therapist collaboration. For example, were people talking about collaboration as if they already do it and was this in turn perhaps limiting the extent to which they actually practised it? Finally, I suggested some of the possible implications, the possibilities, of this analysis.

What is distinctive about my research is that I looked at the professional discourses of teachers and therapists over their collaboration practice in the empirical material and drew upon that knowledge to tentatively map out some implications for future practice. The analysis was concerned with what the discourses that the participants' speak actually do, rather than trying to essentialize or attempt to pin discourses down to what they are. The development of the particular research questions set out above was influenced by an interest in the empirical field of interprofessional, interagency collaborative teamwork. I viewed 'collaboration' as a new practice deployed to intervene in, regulate and control the work of teachers and therapists at a distance. Drawing on Foucault's notion of 'governmentality' (Foucault in Bertani and Fontana, 2003, 284, and see, for example, Hursh, 2003 and Danaher, Shirato and Webb, 2000), I questioned how collaboration was established and critiqued the norms, standards and rules used to police it and the discourses used to justify these. I considered that these questions might be explored in an analysis that examined the underlying assumptions and functioning of power in the collaborating pairs' discourses.

The conceptual framework for this research was initially informed by Biggs' (1997) outline of related but distinctive forms of interprofessional collaboration:

Interprofessional ... may refer to relations between agencies (interagency) or within teams that have members from different disciplines within them (multidisciplinary) (186).

This research borrowed much from others' attempts to grapple with questions of interprofessional and interagency collaborative working. For example, the research on notions of collaboration: interprofessional, multiprofessional, interagency and intersectoral in Biggs (1997), Mathias and Thompson (1997), Ovretveit (1997a, 1997b, 1997c, 1997d) and Weinstein (1997) provided a set of conceptual tools which I have, at different times, critically drawn upon in developing the theoretical terrain of the present research.

The research questions outlined above were developed in order to increase my own and participants' awareness of the matter of their interprofessional, interagency collaborations. The issue of collaboration practice had only recently appeared in the discourses circulating in the relevant policy literature or been considered as an important dimension of the practice of professionals working in this setting. Much of the research in the substantive field has been undertaken by researchers in English institutions and has been concerned with the policy context of England and Wales (see, for example, Kersner, 1996, Kersner and Wright, 1996, Martin and Miller, 1996, Miller 1996, Newman, 1996, RCSLT, 1996, Wright, 1996, Wright and Graham, 1997, Martin and Millar, 1998). Literature concerning the Scottish policy context has subsequently been generated including Reid, Millar, Tait, Donaldson, Dean, Thomson and Grieve (1996), HMI report (1996), McCartney and van der Gaag (1996), McCartney (1999a, 1999b), SCCC (1999). My research questions assume that it is relevant and of importance to build on research concerning this focus with participants working within

the Scottish health and education agencies' policy context and that this research will contribute to that body of knowledge.

The term 'participants' was used in the research questions to represent most accurately my conceptualization of the basis of the involvement of the practitioners in this work.

The research questions imply a research process that will provide a voice for non-dominant individuals within the setting and assume methods that will explore different operations of power/knowledge within their relationships. Although they were not engaged in the research design, during the planning processes and in the empirical work these individuals engaged with the matter of collaboration and actively participated in constructing and reconstructing their collaboration relations in the meetings. Given my research approach, the term 'participant' should not be assumed to be an essential, stable category. I am aware that I thought and spoke of the participants' roles and involvement in a variety of ways at different points in the research, and in different contexts. For example, at times during the empirical work, I considered these people as 'informants', telling me something about their work relationships. However, positioning these people as 'informants' in the context of this dissertation did not fit comfortably as a signifier for my long-term social and work relationships with these individuals. Rather, I was aware that my prevailing non-research relationships already enmeshed me in the working of power relations in these contexts. At other points and in other contexts, for example, in planning this work and when analysing these individuals' accounts, I viewed them as 'contributors' who identified with the aims of the work and gave their accounts and something of their selves to this research.

The assumption that the research provided a space for these individuals' voices from the margins had implications for the research design and for the empirical work, the data presentation and analysis. Lather's (1991) theorizing on 'research as praxis' (57) within a research tradition where 'we consciously use our research to help participants understand and change their situations' (ibid. 57) informed the conceptual and theoretical framework for this work. In the empirical work in this research, I set out to instigate talk of collaboration, to incite participants to do collaboration in action, for example in their meeting talk. In doing this, I perhaps produced a new or different space for the participants in this research to think, talk and write about their particular forms of collaboration work, how they see themselves as collaborating individuals, and how they perform as collaborators. The empirical work foregrounded the notion of collaboration and provided a focus for the participant partners to think and talk about that particular aspect of their busy working lives. It provided some opportunities to reflect over time, and in some cases to try to think differently, about how they had hitherto known and complied with their professional norms and performed particular forms of professional subjectivity. Lather (1991) asserts:

doing empirical work offers a powerful opportunity ... to the extent that it enables people to change by encouraging self-reflection and a deeper understanding of their particular situations (56).

I do not claim that the empirical work in this research was primarily designed or planned to encourage individuals' deep understanding. Rather, it provided a space, opportunities for participants to produce and perform their professional worlds, what they are and what they do.

My decisions about which participants to approach were made after I had worked with a group of twenty possible participants. My work with teacher and therapist partners enabled me to identify three partner pairs who might be happy to tell their stories about working together. The individuals who agreed to participate in this research know me as a long-standing colleague and friend. In the history of our joint personal and professional development, I have, with each participant at various times acted as peer, mentor, teacher, friend, colleague and they have at times reciprocated in fulfilling these roles for me.

The assumption of establishing a participatory approach characterized by, at least, minimal reciprocity was a reflexive concern during the research. Swain's (1995) work explores certain of the issues and processes that are involved in the work to establish participation in research in principle and in practice. For example all of these participants have participated in my life and work and I in theirs in various ways as outlined above. The participant pair from one setting was involved in my research for the Scottish Consultative Council on the Curriculum (SCCC, 1999) and they and the others have read that document and use aspects of it in their joint work. All these participants through our discussions in various formal and informal contexts have

helped to shape my prevailing knowledge of the teacher/therapist work context. In turn, my prevailing knowledge, views and assumptions inform the research questions which I developed. I have shared my knowledge and new and shifting understandings from my on-going reading of the literature with the participants and *vice versa*. We have exchanged views about policy statements including the HMI report (1996) and RCSLT (1996). From the participants' spoken and written responses to the postgraduate module that I learn and teach on, I was aware that 'interprofessional, interagency collaboration' was an issue of interest and importance. The forms that collaboration took, the values and practices associated with different forms of collaboration or changes in forms of collaboration mattered not just to me but was being grappled with daily in the practice of these teachers and therapists.

The research questions were developed within an approach which set out to understand and explore not what collaboration is but what it does and its effects in the various forms in which it is performed in the empirical contexts investigated here. These research questions emerged from my desire to critique the relevant policy documentation and my concern to analyse participants' interprofessional partnership and collaboration discourse. In research questions five and seven I assumed that the meaning of 'collaboration' was not shared unproblematically between the two agencies' professional groups or by individual practitioners within each setting. I assumed that in seeking answers to these questions some different discursive formations would be produced by participants in the empirical work and these discourses would be mapped-out. These questions assumed that 'collaboration' would not be politically or

micropolitically neutral to subjects in the setting and that the values that participants spoke of in their reasons for collaborating would be of interest. The research questions also assumed an analysis of the language games at work in participants' texts concerning collaboration. In particular, participants' use of metaphor should, as Derrida's work reminds us, be taken into account in the reading of the texts.

The research questions are drawn from a theoretical framework for the research design and methodology that considered and attempted to make sense of difference and pluralities in ways of doing collaboration. These research questions were open to individual uncertainties and turbulence at the boundaries and interface between and amongst individuals' personal and professional interests. In developing and wording these research questions I sought to avoid making participants' accounts fit into predetermined models or categories, to reconcile differences or force their stories into a spurious synthesis, unity or completeness. With research question eight, I was concerned to explore the subtle manipulation by individuals of each other. Foucault's conception of 'thinking against', 'agonistic struggle' or 'agonism' (in Barker, 1998, 120), rather than an antagonistic or directly confrontational style, was of interest here.

Research methods

The research questions suggested that written policy texts in the setting, participants' spoken texts concerning collaboration in semi-structured interview and meeting data and their written assignment texts would provide the required textual data for analysis. In the event, these approaches generated too much data. These data collection methods

were planned as a strategy to collect the kind of data which would enable me to answer the research questions within a discourse orientated methodology. The amount of data gathered required me to make data selection decisions before analysing the data but prior to that, all the data that I had planned to gather was collected.

My task in the empirical work was to collect the seven participant professionals' spoken and written collaboration discourses. The seven participants comprised of two teacher/therapist partners and a therapist, two-teacher trio working in school-based language support provision. The empirical material concerning interagency collaborative teamwork in practice was collected in provision meetings. I envisaged that in these meetings participants would articulate their particular way of doing collaboration and discursively take up positions regarding interagency collaboration. I examined participants' individual interview and written texts, more considered and less spontaneous texts, for alternative accounts of collaborative working.

A variety of notions of 'discourse' were important conceptual and critical tools in this analysis. The research was informed by discourse-orientated work in a range of traditions including history of art, cultural theory, media texts, feminist theory, critical discourse analysis, narrative accounts and deconstruction. Harrison, Edwards and Brown (2001) discuss what I read as their 'Foucauldian' notion of 'discourse' in ways that had resonance for this research:

Discourses can be powerful in presenting certain ways of talking and interacting as 'normal', 'socially acceptable' or 'correct', whilst concealing the social and historical contingency of their position. A discursive approach is therefore one that takes account of the exercise of power, addressing questions of who can say what to whom and in what manner (205).

A discourse-based critique of the relevant policy texts and analysis of participants' texts was attempted. The principal approaches to the analysis of the discourse data drew upon 'poststructuralist' discourse theory rather than linguistic 'discourse analysis' (Brannigan, Robbins and Wolfreys, 1996, Danaher, Schirato and Webb, 2000, Fairclough, 1989, 1992, 1995, MacLure, 1994, Mills, 1997, Wolfreys, 1998). The analysis was concerned with questionings and critique of the metaphors and discourses which participants mobilized in their accounts. My meanings and understandings emerged from my subjective different and multiple readings of the text data. My analysis was an attempt to uncover some of the discourses which individual participants drew upon, and to begin to sketch some of the effects of these specific 'truth games' in terms of some dimensions of power and was not an attempt to essentialize a single meaning or 'truth'. Textual examples that foregrounded concerns figuring in the research questions were attended to, as discussed below, in the initial attempts at analysis. Silences and knowledges that were excluded in participants' texts were of equal interest. The analysis uncovers participants' deployment of metaphors as a means to explore the dimensions of the balance of power in participants' collaboration relationship.

In planning the empirical work, I built in a realistic consideration of data needs and resource constraints, for example the fact that discourse transcription is extremely time consuming. Six individual interviews with participants augmented by data from three collaborative pairs' meeting talk where participants speak in-practice the discourses of collaboration would, I thought, provide the required interesting and important data for analysis. The semi-structured interview approach was planned to be informal. I sought to simulate one-to-one, conversational discourse practices in my questioning of the participants. I planned in such discussions to explore and capture participants' disciplinary and practice knowledge. I am now aware that my thinking at that time drew upon 'scientific' conceptualizations of knowledge bases, disciplinary knowledges and the categories and classifications of these. For example, I hoped to explore and capture participants' practice knowledge as it related to earlier 'social-science' mappings. Daines, Fleming and Miller (1996) provided one such mapping.

The combination of approaches to speech and language difficulties which Daines et al (ibid.) identify, illustrates something of the complex interplay of possible knowledge bases which individual practitioners might draw upon in their work. Daines et al suggest that practitioners in the area of language and communication difficulties draw individually and differentially upon medical/biological; linguistic/behavioural; cognitive/psycholinguistic and educational/social knowledge. When planning the empirical work for this research, I then envisaged that the data in participants' spoken and written texts might capture something of their prior work to mesh their individual

and different disciplinary knowledge bases and discourses in fruitful ways for their joint practice. I, at that time, sought to discern practitioner-partners' 'joint template' for their collaboration. I hoped that at the data analysis stage such 'patterns' or themes might 'be evident' in the data. Subsequently, I then planned to analyse the data in terms of the themes of concern in relation to 'productive collaboration' stated in the relevant policy documentation HMI report (1996) and RCSLT (1996).

Perhaps in such a plan I sought to play the game of ordering and classification rather than of critique, questioning and re-thinking discourses and metaphors. For example, as Foucault (1972) suggests, questioning:

the formation of objects, the fields in which they emerge and are specified;
...the conditions of the appropriation of discourses, ... the analysis of social
formations (207).

In my analysis of the empirical material, I explored the emergence of particular dimensions of dominance and subjection in participants' discourses and metaphors. I began to uncover particular metaphors constituting the power relationships in these participants' collaboration relationships for example, concerning accountability and authority. Bishop and Glynn (1999) argue that five areas of activity should be examined and evaluated within power relations 'initiation, benefits, representation, legitimization and accountability' (54). My early attempts to read and analyse the data had suggested that some of these dimensions of the play of dominance-subjection were being

uncovered in the metaphors that participants deployed to constitute their collaboration relationship and in the related discursive manoeuvres. Drawing upon Bishop and Glynn's conceptualizations, I developed my approach to analysis of the empirical material further exploring participants' production of metaphors constituting these specific dimensions of their relationships.

Entering into a dialogue with participants to strive for shared understanding underpinned the research design although, as discussed here, these planned detailed interchange discussions were not the collaborative, participative research which I had envisaged. My pre-empirical stage assumptions concerning the research relationship were continually revisited, wrestled with and changed. I had planned that the interview method and all of the fieldwork and subsequent interaction with participants' data would be 'participative' but I was aware that the attempted 'non-contamination' interview method used here, as described above, was fraught with power imbalances, relational issues and ethical and interpersonal complexities (Goldstein, 2002). I was also aware that I was constantly re-thinking the relationship of these decisions to my chosen methodology and sought to continually question and critique the power/knowledge relations at work in my relationships with participants in the empirical and other work for this research.

Regarding reflexivity

My research questions assume that I reflexively examine my own assumptions, actions and relationships throughout. The main data gathering approaches, as described above,

were underpinned by my commitment to on-going self-awareness concerning the research process. Such a stance perhaps views research itself as a discursive practice and foregrounds the researcher's role as a reader/consumer and writer/producer of texts. Usher (1996a) suggests that:

being reflexive involves surfacing the pre-understandings which inform research and being aware of how these change in the course of research (38-39).

Bernstein's summary of Habermas' position provided by Gitlin, Siegel and Boru (1993) resonates with my view that:

It is an illusion to think that we can assume the position of interested observers by bracketing all our understandings ... we can only [understand others] by adopting the performative attitude of one who participates in the process of mutual understanding (198).

At the start of the empirical work I became very aware of my use of 'I' in all planning and decision making. I was reflexively aware of the researcher power 'to say what to whom' (Harrison et al, 2001, 205) at work in this strategy to acquire the discourse data required for analysis for the purposes of the dissertation and of the non-reciprocal nature of my dialogue with the interviewees. My awareness that the research relationship negotiated was non-collaborative developed at the stage of planning for data gathering. The data gathering approach was planned to explore and collect

'evidence' of the competent solutions of capable practitioners to matters of collaboration practice in their particular school-based language and communication support settings. However, I sensed that the data collection method, planned to elicit participants' discourses and understandings concerning practice, was not actually operating as a collaborative sharing or exchange. I planned a data gathering method which aimed to collect participants' talk and writing as they critically examined aspects of their collaboration practice and which collected the talk as teacher and therapist partners met to speak of their joint work. At that time, as 'researcher', I continued to draw upon a positivist and objectivist methodology, striving to avoid influencing, 'skewing' or 'contaminating' the data in my discussions with the practitioners.

The interview method utilized an interview schedule of a few open questions and probes, which related to each research question. The interview questions were formulated in advance to try to ensure that the data required to answer the specific research questions was collected. I was aware that the particular interview questions asked, relating to each of the research questions, shaped the discourse and subsequently the data available for analysis. I assumed discursive reflexivity, the need to take account of my own discursive practices in the interviews, and of how this influenced interviewees' answers. I was, during data collection and analysis, reflexively aware of the effect of power/knowledge relations influencing participants; for example, as soon as I invoked words like 'collaboration' interviewees would modify their enunciations in response to their reading of my discursive practices.

Seeking a reliable, stable foundation for the empirical work

The interview schedule was re-worded at the pilot stage to take account of my concern to avoid any prompts which might impose my particular conceptual framework or force participants' stories into that particular framework. I re-worded the original schedule to avoid closed questions and 'do you think' questions, keeping the questions and possible responses as open-ended as possible. I was concerned to let the interviewees speak at whatever length to their agenda and to avoid inserting my particular take on the issue or the 'key' concerns which might not be important or have been influential for the participants. I was concerned to use informal, conversational language to establish that this was not in any way a test or a check and to avoid introducing or prompting any notions which the interviewee had not thought of. For example asking *Who runs the show? Have you come across...?* and *What did you make of it?* or *What did you think of it?* If a participant was uncertain of my meaning, I re-stated it with a *Well I'm thinking of just...* prompt to avoid conversational breakdowns occurring - and, I am aware, avoiding participants' 'loss of professional face' and subsequent tension. I was concerned to prompt further by offering back parts of participants' accounts for example: *You've talked about meetings. So are meetings, for you, the way that you collaborate?*

There was an on-going dilemma in the chosen data collection technique of semi-structured interview method of trying not to distort participants accounts but wanting to introduce the question of their experience in relation to a number of particular issues for example, the publication of HMI (1996) recommendations. I was concerned to get at

participants' accounts of their collaborations-in-action asking interviewees to *talk through a day where collaboration took place*. While this strategy did result in participants' productions of accounts of collaboration-in action, the blandness of their collaboration talk remained an issue and a concern.

Gathering participants' written assignment accounts proved to be very straightforward. All participants had retained copies of their written work and agreed to provide these to me for research purposes. My initial reading of participants' written assignment accounts suggested that in the written text data too, participants spoke the versions of collaboration legitimated in the policy texts. Two attempts to analyse the written assignment data resulted in my production of equally bland analyses. These first two attempts at analysis are discussed in detail in chapter 7 below

Seeking texts that manifested the therapist/teacher power struggles

The third strategy for gathering data from the participants was in relation to their talk in collaborative meetings. I did not participate in these meetings but gave each pair an audiotape and asked them to tape their next meeting. The Inverian Language Unit partners of course included the teacher's job-share partner in their meeting talk. The Inverian partners had some concerns about suitable topics for discussion. I suggested their usual planning meeting talk would be appropriate but that 'if they were stuck' that the contents of a school-based service-level agreement which I had previously given them might stimulate discussion. I made the same suggestion to the Glenian Primary School Provision partners when they said they *were at a loss for something to talk*

about. In the event, the Inverian trio chose to talk about planning for re-integration of children into their local neighbourhood schools while the Glenian partners used the service-level agreement as a focus for their discussion. In the Benian Primary School Base, the participants chose to audiotape their planning meeting talk. This third strategy for gathering data overcame the issue of participants talking the legitimate collaboration talk as they actually performed their versions of collaboration and the operation of power in their relationships in the talk that they produced.

I decided that this partnership meeting data where participants perform collaboration was the most fruitful material in which to explore the overall research question: what are the issues of power/knowledge for these teachers and therapists in their specific collaboration relationships? Selection of the meeting data rather than the interview or written assignment data for the analysis was justified for several reasons other than the smoothness of the interview and written text data. The collaborators were, in the meeting talk, experiencing and producing collaboration. The participants were performing-in-practice their specific operation and balance of the power dimensions in the discourses and metaphors which they chose to deploy in their meeting talk. As a non-participant, I was implicated only indirectly in the operation of power in these accounts. However, I was aware that in seeking audio-recordings of their partnership meetings for the purposes of the research I was implicated and enmeshed in the positions that people constructed. In these taped meetings, I assume that they spoke with an eye on the recording. They were, in that sense, performing, perhaps parading, their various collaboration identities for the tape-recording and for me.

Ethical decisions

The research questions and the conceptual and theoretical framework underpinning the design implied that a range of ethical, moral and political questions, concerns and dilemmas would arise during the research. This research has provided an opportunity for re-thinking concepts and the meaning of terms and the values underpinning practices. For example, ethically questioning the non-reciprocal nature of the interview talk and my actual research relationships with the individuals participating in the research required, as discussed above, on-going reflexivity. The research design implied such on-going researcher reflexivity and self-consciousness concerning ethical issues and questions. These were re-considered and conscientiously and sensitively addressed throughout so that no participant would consider herself harmed by any aspect of this research process. My subject position as researcher/author is subjective and systematic reflexivity concerning representations of my textualized 'selves' throughout helped me to remain conscious of that.

The research method assumed research relations based on openness, researcher/participant reciprocity and a realistic degree of participants' informed consent. Burgess (1989) discusses the complexities of the notion of informed consent for the research design and process. I sought to be reflexive throughout about my development of 'solutions' or responses to address the main ethical issue and dilemma that emerged - my research relationships with the participants.

Below I attempt to rethink the concept of 'participants' and the values and identities underpinning my research practices as they relate to that term. The research questions imply a concern to draw upon the pre-established honest relationships of respect and trust that have been built-up over years of personal and professional talk and interaction with the participants and to develop these in an, at least minimally, reciprocal research relationship. I sought 'informed consent' on the basis that confidentiality and anonymity were assured to all participants. The participants were made aware that their consent was sought on the basis that such confidentiality assurances are 'not watertight' (Denzin and Lincoln, 1998, 175). For example, because of the highly specialised nature of the research sites, interested readers might identify these schools and the participants and therefore, their anonymity could not be guaranteed.

The research design assumed collection of the data openly but I was aware that I was setting, managing and controlling the various agendas that require to be successfully accomplished to progress the research and ensure collection of the required information. I employed carefully considered strategies to ensure access, build research relationships and acquire the necessary data. Although this is perhaps inevitable in a study that is primarily for the purpose of fulfilling the requirements of a research degree and carried out within time and other resources constraints, it makes on-going reflexive self-awareness essential. At another level, as my thinking and writings have developed during the research, I have found that the discursive space of this dissertation has produced on-going reflexivity concerning my taken-for-granted practices and ways of construing the world.

The research methodology assumed the negotiation of access for research purposes to contexts where I had previously worked in a variety of professional roles and within which I retained personal and professional contacts and relationships. This facilitated entry for research purposes to all three sites. Participant therapists and teachers did not fear 'expert' surveillance. However, some unease about being questioned in a 'research context' and 'for the record' about their collaborative working practices was, at times, as expected, evident in the data and will be discussed in the analysis below. I was aware of the power at work in using my affective relationship with participants to get at their view of the world. My particular researcher self presented to participants had implications for the subsequent nuances and contradictions in the various research interactions and relationships and in turn, for the actual talk data available for analysis. My impulse was to contribute to reciprocity in the relationship between myself as researcher and the participants during the semi-structured interview conversations in the empirical work in the research. However, I am aware that the version of self that I articulated in the interviews and wider research context was, as described by Fairclough (1992), constrained in various ways by the need to successfully accomplish, in interviewer and researcher terms, the planned interviews and other research requirements.

I obtained written permission for access for research purposes from the relevant Directors of Education and the headteacher of each of the three school sites. Subsequently I discussed the purposes of the research project openly and fully with

each participant. I sought to describe fully and accurately the dimensions of the investigation and the demands that participation would bring in terms, for example, of time implications, intrusions by me into their workplace, extra work or cover for one another and all other inconvenience, for example, posting back the meeting-talk tape to me. I also addressed issues of confidentiality concerning future use of the data collected.

I sought to ensure that each participant understood that I planned to analyse all the interview material in order to answer the research questions. I described to each participant what I planned to do in my analysis specifically, my interest in discourse and the effects of discourse. I had not at that time, for example, developed an interest in the use of metaphor as a strategy for analysis. I sought and obtained participants' agreements that they would not have any opportunity to amend the interview data. I offered participants an opportunity to comment on any uncertain utterances emerging in the interviews' and meetings' transcriptions texts and for any such comment to be written-in to the final dissertation text in ways that identified it as such. This approach is informed by Tripp's caution (cited in Lather, 1991) that 'the negotiation process must be clearly bounded... because participants often wish to 'unsay' their words' (58; original emphasis). As no important uncertainties concerning utterances emerged in the transcription texts, it was not necessary to implement any negotiation process with any of the participants.

Standards of judgement

During this research my thinking and understandings of research gradually shifted. I drew upon new conceptual, critical and analytical tools and I attempted to construct a fair, reflexive account of the work as it emerged from those changing perspectives. Accommodating some version of conventional positivist conceptualization of validity or 'truth' was not appropriate to the epistemology of this work. More appropriate criteria and standards for evaluating the 'trustworthiness' of this research, and for assessing and legitimating this research text's representations are discussed in the literature, for example, in the perspectives suggested by Barker, 1998, Lather, 1986a, 1986b, 1992, 1993, 1996, 1997, Scott and Usher, 1996, Stronach and MacLure, 1997, Scheurich, 1997, St Pierre and Pillow, 2000. Stronach and MacLure (1997) discuss aspects of the crisis of representation relevant to the planned research, noting that:

post-structuralist and post-modernist approaches tend to regard notions of validity as somewhat suspect and either utopian or repressive expressions of whatever 'regime of truth' (100; original emphasis).

Thinking about the evaluative criteria or standards for this work was one of my 'knottiest' reflexive struggles. Grappling with notions of the 'fairness' or 'trustworthiness' of this account was an on-going concern. Scheurich (1997), discussing the 'masks of validity' (1) argues that 'validity, whether defined as truth or as trustworthiness, is an enactment of a modernist bias, an exclusionary, damaging bias' (ibid. 1). This research was concerned with critique, sceptical questioning and with the

production of a reflexive story of the work rather than privileging notions of systematicity.

Lather (1986b) reconceptualizes validity as minimally building in triangulation of methods, data sources and theories and reflexive subjectivity. Attention to these kinds of validity criteria informed the treatment of validity in the planning stage. For example, I built in 'triangulation' of methods to gather data drawn from a variety of sources and perspectives. I was, at that time, 'enacting the practices of reason' (Scheurich, 1997, 171). Scheurich reminds us that building in systematicity in research procedures is a spurious building-in of the practices of 'reason' or modernism's means to truth about the 'really real'. As my research and my reading progressed, my thinking around the issue was changed and put into question by my reading and reflexive thinking. I became aware that attempts to legitimise my emerging account by these kinds of supports of 'objectivity and reason' were 'unfitting'.

Conventional positivist and postpositivist scientific paradigm concepts of objectivity, external validity and generalizability were not relevant criteria to judge this research, given its theoretical terrain. This research does not seek to claim 'validity' in the sense of it being a 'true' or rational account. The question of validity within the writing of a reflexive, self-questioning account that is concerned with analysing my own assumptions in the concepts that I use in my thinking in ways that are incomplete and unfinished is, I am aware, complex. I struggled to re-think notions of validity within a theoretical framework that questions 'classical' notions of truth and objectivity. The

purpose of this research was to increase my understanding of the initial, very provisional, 'key' term collaboration and issues around its practices in the linked work of teachers and therapists. Perhaps a goodness or quality criterion that is relevant to the perspective underpinning this work is Denzin and Lincoln's (1998) proposal of 'historical situatedness' (210). What I have done here is examined the operation of collaboration relations in specific historico-cultural contexts. In this text I sought to remain aware of and expose the issues of representation, how discourses and metaphors actually manifest power relations, including my own with the participants in this research. What are produced here are writings and re-writings of my thinking as my thinking shifted through different ways of viewing and doing research.

Frameworks and methods for analysis

As outlined above and below, an on-going concern in this research was how the operation of the collaboration relation between teachers and therapists might be analysed. On the basis of the interview data collected, discourse analysis and illustration in relation to the matters of interest was undertaken. Foucault's analytical tools were drawn upon as appropriate to explore the effects of collaboration policy from a 'post-structuralist' perspective. For example, instances were uncovered in the empirical material of the strategies and tactics of power. The forces of normalization through which disciplinary power is exercised in relation to collaboration were explored and participants' limits and transgressive practices were analysed. I approached the critique and analysis by reading and re-reading the transcribed data texts seeking metaphors for analysis. The research questions implied an attempt to

capture participants' texts to explore the pluralities and instabilities in individuals' functioning and self-positionings with/in the professional discourses and personal agendas which influence and shape views of interpersonal, interprofessional and interagency work in these specific sites.

The research questions assumed an approach, which sought to uncover in the spoken and written text data, unique syntheses of personal and professional discourses. The aim at that point, was to allow the data to speak, to explain, if appropriate, that participants' talk is a mixture of discourses and that the policy texts are full of contradictions and ambivalences. I was, then, concerned in the analysis to unpack the assumptions of policy and in the participants' texts concerning the notion of collaboration. I planned to explore individuals' discourses about their specific efforts to collaborate, for example, examining difference in notions of 'productive' (HMI, 1996, 33) collaborative practices. I sought to identify and discuss some of the difficulties, constraints and differences in collaborative working. I hoped to tentatively make some particular claims about the empirical settings and to draw out some fairly specific implications from the findings in order to make suggestions that might help to mediate collaborative practice in the sites at interpersonal, interprofessional and interagency levels.

Introducing my positional voice and perspectival thinking

Whom or what am I speaking on behalf of, and to whom am I speaking in this work? I planned to 'close' this research down (see, for example, Stronach and MacLure, 1997)

into a 'realist' text for the primary target audience of the dissertation, the University of Stirling, Doctorate in Education board of examiners. I intended to show that I was doing this reflexively. However, what I am actually doing in my writing is trying to keep the text open as I wrestle with its form in trying to word my shifting thinking. My reflexive voice in questions and asides throughout this text was an attempt to remain self-conscious and self-critical. I sought to introduce something of my own appraisal of how I was thinking as that shifted and of how my production and representation of meanings was operating.

I hoped that this dissertation would offer suggestions about professionals' collaboration practices and the operation of collaboration discourses in these specific school-based contexts that would be, in themselves, worthwhile. During the research I became aware that a different means needed to be found to write about aspects of the research for multiple audiences. I have sought to remain reflexively aware of the role of language in my thinking, talking and writing and its implications in relation to, for example, issues and concerns in relation to representation, power/knowledge and 'validity' or standards of judgement.

The role of language discourses and rhetoric in academic writing is of reflexive concern here. Reflexivity concerning metaphor produced an opening to question the notion of 'truth'. Nietzsche (in Novak, 2001) asks:

What then is truth? A mobile army of metaphors... in short, a sum of human relations, which have been enhanced, transposed, embellished poetically and rhetorically, and which after long use seem firm, canonical and obligatory to a people (42).

This view of the polyvalence of truth, that there is no single truth, that truths are always perspectival was discussed in chapter 2.

Interested readers of this dissertation might include: participants; local authority officers providing access (one Local Authority Director of Education requested access to the final report at the point of agreement for access); the two professional groups concerned; readers of relevant professional journals; interest groups including parents and voluntary agencies. I have sought and used appropriate ways to effectively disseminate the research. Teachers, therapists and researchers in the substantive area of teacher/therapist collaboration were the audience envisaged for peer reviewed papers published in appropriate academic journals during the research. Further publications concerning other aspects of the research for teacher/therapist peers are planned. I have discussed various aspects and dimensions of the research with groups of teachers and speech and language therapists and teacher/therapist educators. I have integrated shifting thinking from my research work into my lecturer self's writing and development of postgraduate modules. The research, constituting some new things said in these settings will, I suggest, affect participants' policy-making and practice within their particular school-based contexts. The research and my suggestions may be of

interest to those working in and managing similar settings in ways that inform policy development and effect institutional change.

Power dimensions in the move to collaboration

Shifting assumptions in official policy discourses have historically ordered individuals' thinking to construct and delimit possible ways of acting and working for teachers and therapists. Discursive formations in recent policy documentation; legitimizing collaboration (see, for example, HMI, 1996, RCSLT, 1996, SOEID, 1998), have migrated into interagency documentation at macro (national), meso (local authority) and micro (school) levels. In this research, I explored how these kinds of new interprofessional discourses have functioned to order and control teachers' and therapists' practice differently and to exercise power and knowledges in particular ways over practitioners.

My research provided a space for critique and reflection concerning official policy statements, asking professionals to make personal sense of changing official notions of professionalism as they participated in various stages of in-betweenness in the new and shifting habitat of interagency collaboration. Through critique of interprofessional collaboration policy texts, therapists and teachers unpacked and appraised the discourses of professionalism that are represented in policy. The participants in this empirical work produced in their writing and speaking and performed in their meeting talk their individual versions and questionings of policies' underlying concepts, theories, assumptions, values framework and functions. Teachers and therapists as

practitioners in this particular policy context produced their analyses of the officially legitimated policy discourses of interprofessional collaboration. They made personal sense of policy in their performances of it. They talked their knowledges, opinions, values and interests in response to collaboration policy particular exercise of power and strategies to re-order their lives and work.

As outlined in greater detail below, the domination of organizational, systems and new management theory in relation to interprofessional collaboration has produced a number of 'authoritative' studies that draw on positivist paradigm views of the world and on positivism's related quantitative objective research methods. In this work I attempted to critique some of the positivist research tradition's 'expert' work which has sought to objectify collaboration and produce research on teachers and therapists. Such an approach which fails to listen carefully to participants' voices and individuals' subjective accounts did not provide conceptual tools for this work. In this work I questioned and critiqued some of the underlying assumptions and research processes privileged in positivist research methodology's discourses. In my empirical work I sought to collect individuals' subjective accounts of collaboration. I planned to collect, critique and analyse some of the polyphony of voices, the multiple and diverse discourses concerning the plurality of 'realities' and 'truths' about collaboration which were spoken in the literature and in participants' accounts.

The referent 'collaboration' is unstable, slippery and constantly mutating. Successful teacher/therapist collaboration has in the literature, as suggested above and discussed

more fully below, most often been measured and categorized in terms of systems or organizational theory performance or 'quality' evaluation indicators. Positivist research has also implied that the characteristics of 'successful' interprofessional/interagency collaboration, once identified, will unquestionably have wider applicability in generalized prescriptions or 'recommendations'. One of my assumptions in this research was that these kinds of recommendations do not attend to the difficulties involved especially between professionals from different backgrounds who have been professionally inducted with/in very different disciplinary discourses, for example, medical, linguistic, psycholinguistic, sociological, psychological. My reading of the literature suggested that this positivistic research tradition has contributed little to understanding subjective meanings and experiences of individual people in professional work producing collaboration-in-action.

I assumed that individual participants' partnership discourses and their effects require to be inserted into this particular research space. I attempted such a move that privileged new approaches based on participants' voice and empowerment and foregrounded the changed social relations within which research takes place. I explored how the selves, experiences and activities of individual practitioners have been ordered and thought and re-ordered and re-thought in the various historical layers of collaboration documentation. I examined how the words and concepts in participants' accounts, their collaboration discourses, have fitted in to these historical layers of thinking and acting collaboration. I aimed to uncover the seemingly arbitrary, trivial and petty everyday purposes and effects of collaboration for the participants in their accounts. For example,

whose interests and agendas participants felt were promoted, who participants thought benefited from collaboration, who collaboration excluded or diminished in power and how the power in participants' collaborations oscillated producing struggles, adjustments and compromises.

As sketched above, my concern was not with the pure essences of these levels of collaboration discourse but with their 'discursive effects'. I was interested to analyse the relationship between the power/knowledge that collaboration discourses deploy in their different discursive formations and their consequences. I sought to critique the wider literature's historical deployments of notions of 'collaboration' and its associated terms and to bring these readings to bear on the school-based teacher/SLT relationship. I gathered participants' productions and performances of notions of 'productive collaboration', essentialized by HMI (1996) as 'mutual trust and respect, joint goal setting, joint training and parental satisfaction with the provision' (33) and accounts in which participants spoke of the RCSLT (1996) 'professional standards' (ibid. title page) or 'norms' of collaborative work.

Reflexive aside: I was increasingly aware that a number of the tools used for understanding collaboration sought to list the essences of collaboration (see for example, RCSLT, 1996, HMI, 1996) or set out to classify the norms of collaborative practice (see, for example, Marvin in McCartney, 1999b and

diMeo et al in McCartney, 1999b). Further, I sensed that there was 'something going on' in the 'evidence' that was valued in much of the research on collaboration. I knew from my review of the literature, for example, that much of the published work drew upon a rather limited range of legitimized tools: systems theory, soft systems theory and multi-level modelling approaches. It seemed that the conceptual and analytical tools of objective social-scientific method were those embraced, developed and deployed by 'legitimate' workers in the field of collaboration. I began to question the dominance of postpositivist social science's traditions of rationality functioning as a form of social control and power in developing collaboration theory. In Foucauldian terms, how do these objectivist and postpositivist historical ways of thinking and acting, or 'discursive formations', order possible ways of thinking about collaboration? I wished to critique the apparent innocence of this rather narrow and exclusionary scientificist rationality. It is my shifting thinking about the privileging of certain tools and techniques for argument

about collaboration practices and effects that I attempt to present here.

Rethinking my overall research problem

Having rethought my research problem as my conceptual and theoretical framework changed during the planning and empirical work, my main research question was re-written as follows:

How do power/knowledge relations function in these teachers' and therapists' specific collaboration relationships?

My re-thinkings of my research problem continued throughout the research as my previous and prevailing frameworks for thinking were continuously questioned and displaced.

CHAPTER 3b

METHODOLOGICAL DECISIONS: CHRONOLOGICAL SIGNPOSTS

I have written throughout this research. Learning from a talk given to the EdD course participants on 'writing your thesis', I continually wrote, re-wrote and over-wrote a series of documents in which I recorded my emerging thinking, possible openings, current struggles and ignorances and many, many questions rather than answers. In these rolling-documents I also wrote-in and organically and reflexively over-wrote and cross-referenced all my new thinking and learning. For example, I recorded and reflexively commented on my current reading; empirical work; writing of the final thesis text and associated papers and conference presentations; and my discussions with university and school teacher and therapist colleagues and EdD course peers and supervisors. I have also drawn on my research notes and scribbles to write the reflexive aside data, which I analyse within my thesis to uncover my shifting assumptions and to reveal my changed epistemological and ontological positions and identifications.

I reveal these emergent notions and traces of my searches, struggles and decisions to provide some transparency about the research journey that I have taken. These traces are interesting because they show how doctoral learning constitutes complex and subtle processes which inscribe the text with often unintended meanings. Although, in what follows, there may be some repetition of aspects covered in chapter 3a, my emphasis

here is to provide some signposts of the chronology of my research journey for the reader.

Autumn 1998

I approached the work for the EdD having taken on the discourses of sociolinguistics. Unaware of new thinking about the function of language and new constructions of the relationship between language and society and the concept of individual agency I, at that point, took a structuralist, liberal humanist view of the social functions of language and of individual identity. In my early thinking, planning and writing for my thesis I use discourses that draw on ideas of language structures, language as a system and language skills and competencies.

Accepting the position that language provided direct access to the 'real world' and 'true story', I was initially concerned to explore how the language of spoken texts is constructed and its social and ideological effects, and traces of this thinking remain in chapter 3a of my thesis. I then drew on various linguistic and disciplinary perspectives that took an unproblematic view of the relation between language and reality. Such perspectives suggest that linguistic discourse analysis, the interactions between participants, text and context, combines language analysis and social theory (Halliday, 1978, Sinclair and Coulthard, 1975, Kress and Hodge, 1979, Potter and Wetherall, 1987, Coates, 1994). My early thinking and writing also drew on the critical discourse analysis (CDA) thinking of Norman Fairclough (1989) which rejects sociolinguistic concerns with the 'social features and functions of language in different social contexts;

rather, CDA approaches explore the range of discourse types imposed on and thus made available to people in social institutions such as schools.

As I read more widely, I discovered approaches derived from a poststructuralist perspective on language, subjectivity and institutional discourse practices. During autumn 1998 and unit 1 of the EdD, I began to read Lyotard (1984), Derrida (1981a, 1981b), and Foucault (1972, 1977 and in Gordon 1980) and, for example, MacLure (1994), Scheurich (1997) and Stronach and MacLure (1997). Such texts provided me with alternative epistemological and ontological perspectives and discursive resources to those of linguistic and sociolinguistic approaches' structuralist views of the uncomplicated relation between the word and the real.

At that point, I had not worked out the final methodological position that I take in my thesis and there are traces of my previous linguistic notions of language in my first and second attempts at analysis, which are discussed in chapter 7. My position at that time was shifting; for example, I was beginning to view 'realities' as discursive and to accept that there is no access to a transcendental reality beyond or outside discourse. But simultaneously, I remained tied to assumptions of a 'real world' and of an integrated liberal humanist self with self-actualising possibilities in the rigid, systematic, certain, 'objective' thinking and methods which I clung to (see chapter 7). MacLure (2003) speaks of such assumptions:

that language exists as an abstract system... Such definitions suggest that linguistic discourse analysis still operates largely within a structuralist mode of knowing and acting, where the boundary between language and the 'real' world is secure, and where discourse is conceptualized as rule-governed, systematic and logical. Conceptual 'mastery' of discourse is, therefore, possible in principle, both for linguists and lay speakers...the notion of the coherent, humanist self also persists more-or-less intact in many linguistic models of discourse (182).

I was at that point learning to live with research uncertainty and chapter 7 does not describe 'mastery'; rather, it depicts my struggles with the epistemological and ontological uncertainties and ambivalences that I was experiencing at that point.

Spring/summer 1999

During the spring and early summer of 1999 I was reading and writing with a focus on analysis, criticism and interpretation of research and sections of chapters 2 and 4 of my thesis depict my thinking and learning then. In particular, I was grappling with the notion of the kinds of criteria used to judge articles, for example, the inapplicability of attempts to apply conventional standards for judging quantitative research studies to qualitative paradigm research. There are traces of my grapplings with the question of the standards by which my thesis might be judged in chapter 3a. I was also looking for the textual strategies which make texts unravel. I was able to identify some interesting and illuminative examples of textual strategies but was mostly talking about them at a

general level. I became interested in showing how the text unravels itself through these discursive ploys. I read some deconstruction in Brannigan, Robbins and Wolfreys (1996) and Wolfreys (1998) to look at what is done with the text and there are traces of this reading and thinking throughout my subsequent thinking and writing of my thesis, in particular in chapter 4.

During the autumn of 1999 I was developing the conceptual framework for my research by reading and writing around questions of the impact of policy on professional practice. I was developing a critical account of different perspectives on professionalism. I began to raise the notion of resistance in this work - what scope there is for individual professionals or professionals working collaboratively, to resist and contest the 'given' framework of competence. I also began to point to the way the policies have acquired new ways of speaking and working. I was making claims about the unstable nature of policy development, sticking to the policy texts themselves, showing how the new language emerges but I needed to go on and show how the language contradicts or undermines itself. In other words, at that time, I was reading documents and identifying discourses and practices but needed to give each text a second reading with the perspectives of these discourses and practices - so that I was reading the document against itself. I tried to find an example of someone who had done this but couldn't. In this work I was complicating my thinking about the policy-practice relation by exploring complex ideas about policy making performances, the policy process and its impact on professionals. I still slipped into reification at that point, for example, making postmodernity into a 'thing', shifting conceptions of reality

and practices - I had been reading/mis-reading Zurbrugg (1993). My analysis attempted to tease out individuals' capacity to resist and contest in policy arenas. Chapter 4 of my thesis depicts my thinking at that time.

Spring 2000

In spring 2000 I developed a clearer account of the focus of my research and the strategy I planned to adopt and I use that thinking in chapter 3a of my thesis. I was, at that time, developing a precise proposal of what I intended to do in the empirical work while remaining open to the different forms of knowledge which might be possible. I was still attempting to grapple carefully and knowledgeably with the questions of 'validity', articulating perhaps the most problematic aspect of my research - I was aware that I needed some alternative story to the conventional one on validity. In my reading/writing, I was grappling with the notion of 'trustworthiness' - a notion which I viewed as more complex than straightforward truth - and I include some of these constructions in chapter 3a. At that time, drawing on the thinking of Royle in Wolfreys (1998) who talks of how people like Derrida and Beckett get dismissed as if they have been read, I began to think about how collaboration is thought. I wondered if collaboration is affected in the same way, with people talking about collaboration as if they already do it, which in turn could limit the extent to which they practice it. This thinking weaves through my subsequent writing within all of the thesis chapters and is made particularly clear in chapter 11.

Exploring the Foucauldian notion of 'disciplinary regime', a regime with a new set of rules of engagement, I had begun to grasp the notion that everything is discursive and only known through the discourses which enunciate it. I use this thinking in chapters 9, 10 and 11 of my thesis. I had also begun to accept that my deconstruction would necessarily be messy and incomplete, showing elements of undecideability - as chapter 9 and 10 of the thesis illustrate.

Summer/autumn 2000

I had been formulating and developing my research questions since starting unit 1. The research question and sub-questions that I had developed at this point (see chapter 3a) had been developed and re-worked during 1998 and 1999 and right up until the end of unit 4 in June 2000. At that point, my research questions were worded as they are in chapter 3a and my overall research question was formulated as 'what are the issues of power/knowledge for these teachers and therapists in their specific collaboration relationships?'.

The conceptual and theoretical frameworks underlying the research sub-questions (RSQ) are further developed and all the RSQ are addressed at various points in the thesis. For example, how collaboration was previously put to work (RSQ2) is critiqued in chapter 4 and analysed in chapter 6. RSQ 5 and 6 perhaps most clearly identify the in-betweenness in my thinking as I formulated these initial research questions. In these questions I continue to tie participants' constructions of collaboration to the policy statements in the ways depicted in the first and second attempts at analysis in chapter 7

although I was struggling to shift from being technical and essentialist. For example, I no longer sought discourses at work at 'macro, meso and micro levels'. I was speaking of exploring what the discourses that people speak, do, rather than trying to essentialize or attempt to pin discourses down to what they are - but, at that time, I had to make sure that I did actually resist my essentializing and reifying tendencies. My data collection method privileged and sought considered accounts in written texts and semi-structured interviews - although, as from the start, I sensed that there would be interesting data about collaboration-in-action in the partners' meeting talk.

Prior to the empirical work my thinking about my research relationships with the participants was of concern. I was carefully scrutinizing my motives for seeking high levels of engagement among 'my participants'. I had accepted that my approach would not be 'participatory' in the senses described in my reading of Lather (1986b, 1991, 1993) and others. Some of the complexities in my thinking about this relationship at that time are more fully described and analysed in chapter 3a. My on-going struggles were about what to make of this relationship in my analysis and writing. The data gathering for this research was completed over a very compressed timescale. The face to face aspect of data collection comprised the individual semi-structured interviews, each of which was less than ninety minutes. Permission for access for research purposes was sought from Directors of Education and school headteachers in the summer of 2000 - at the start of the third year of my research. Agreement to participate was sought from individuals during autumn 2000.

Spring/summer 2001

The semi-structured interviews took place during February and March 2001 and the audiotaped partners' meeting data was gathered by May 2001. From my initial planning of the research, I was interested in participants' texts and discourses (see chapter 3a) and in my 'planning stage' early grappling with the complexities of the researcher-subject relationship, I considered that issues of on-going 'relationship managing' would be of concern. But, as I discuss in chapter 3a, my research did not become the kind of collaborative, participative research that I had initially envisaged. Partly I think, due to the type of empirical work which I undertook and perhaps because of time and other resource constraints on myself and the participants, the research did not work out as an on-going collaboration and this is discussed more fully in chapter 3a.

During the planning and empirical work as I came to view research as a space of positions, I sought to understand my shifting positions in relation to those of the participants and I discuss this in chapter 3a. At the empirical stage, my reading around ethico-political positions (Simons, 1995, Kritzman, 1988, Rabinow, 2000) impelled me to re-think this specific ethico-political self-Other relation. I accepted that I had not built-up the kind of relation of co-participative partnership which I had envisaged at the planning stage. MacLure (2003) points out that 'partnership' is one of 'the guises that this desire to eliminate the difference between researcher and researched can take' (170). My reflexivity concerning my own and others' research positionings and re-positionings around, for example, questions of voice, agendas, agency, mastery enabled

me to call into question the changes in my planning stage and pre-research understandings about the researcher-participant relation.

During the empirical work I was shifting from a search for built-in-barriers-to-bias kinds of 'objectivity' to a concern to write in shifts in my research relationships, for example the power shifts instituted by my changed data analysis methods. I applied reflexivity to my analysis of the research relation and it may be that I 'just used' these individuals as the handiest sources of data. But nothing is innocently 'just', as MacLure (2003) suggests of relations with research subjects:

Perhaps we should stop trying to: befriend them, respect them collaborate with them, worship them, pity them, empathize with them, patronize them, know them, save them, control them, surrender to them, explain them, like them, celebrate them...Or, rather, recognize that we can never *simply* do any of these, even if we might feel impelled to try, in order to shore up our methodological or ethical self-assurance (171).

The power dimensions at work in these particular researcher-subject relationships and positions and the entangled identities of researcher-subject-friend-lecturer-course-participant at work are clearly important. However a detailed analysis of this is not within the scope of this research. Having completed the empirical work, I wrote sections of chapter 5, which introduces the research sites and participants. Writing up that chapter, I moved from imposing my account of each individual and the three places

of work to a position where I drew on the data so that each participant introduced themselves and their work site in their own words.

Autumn 2001/summer 2002

As I undertook the empirical stage of the research, I had continued with further reading and re-reading of Foucault (1972, 1977, and in Gordon, 1980). I analysed the data gathered to answer the RQ and RSQ as formulated in chapter 3a. Some of the 'answers' thread through the thesis more permeatively but for specific 'answers' see chapter 6 (RSQ2), chapter 4 (RSQ 4) and chapters 6 and 7 (RSQ 5, 6 and 7). I now took the view that participants' discourse/practice in their meetings would provide the data which I sought for analysis of collaboration-in-action (chapter 9).

My RQ, as initially formulated in the thesis (see chapter 3a), was concerned to uncover 'the issues of power/knowledge' for these individuals in their relationships; and initial attempts to analyse the data (chapter 6 and 7) had revealed specific dimensions of power at work. After reading Foucault I was now interested in a new RQ (see chapter 3a: Re-thinking my overall research problem). Now, rather than stopping at exposing the power dimensions, I wished to reveal how they worked in-practice. I wanted to uncover how the talk is framed around the 'ideals' of collaboration but to go further and reveal how and where does it fragment or unravel. At that time I was interested in the discontinuities in the formal and informal talk which expose the power/knowledge knots. For example, in my readings of the data I had uncovered glimmers of disjunctures in the talk which, in the final attempt at analysis in chapter 9, helped to

expose some of the fragmentation. I was by this stage interested in a more analytically fruitful research question about 'how do participants produce/perform collaboration in ways which create closure, reduce risk and prevent any meeting of minds or practices?' That is, how do they become so bound with the authoritative voice that is so firmly embedded in the documents? Reading the work of Bishop and Glynn (1999) provided an analytical lens suited to analysis of the dimensions of power which I had begun to uncover in the data (chapter 7). As I discuss in chapter 9, my early readings of the data suggested that the issues of power which participants repeatedly introduced in their accounts were those around: initiation, benefits, representation, accountability and legitimisation.

Autumn 2002/spring 2003

My thinking continued to shift with my struggles to read and write during the empirical year, year 3, and into 'the write-up years', years 4 and 5, although I had been writing throughout the EdD years from the start. During year 4 I wrote-in a much fuller account of my reading of Foucault and the relevance of that to my work in chapter 2. I added to chapter 4 my new thinking about grappling with collaboration using metaphor as a tool. Drawing on the participants' written text and semi-structured interview accounts, I completed chapter 5 in which I introduce the research sites and participants in their own terms. Completing the writing-up of chapter 6, I presented participants' accounts 'storying' previous forms of collaboration. I presented these accounts of different ways of doing or silencing collaboration in other historically contingent circumstances to sit with the current accounts data in chapters 7 and 9. In September 2002 having written

the thesis introduction, chapter 1, and the final 'suggestions' which I make in chapter 11, I produced a first messy full-draft of all chapters of my thesis, aware that there was much re-thinking and re-writing to be done.

After reading Lather (1991) and others who take the view that 'whatever 'the real' is, it is discursive' (25). I began to look for a lens with which to capture the participants' truth claims which, drawing on Foucault (2000a, 2000b, 2000c), I now viewed as having been developed with/in particular power/knowledge structures. Reading Nietzsche (in Novak, 2001) I began to grasp the position that truth is something which people produce in their language and metaphor. After reading Derrida (1981a) I started to explore metaphors as the devices which the participants used to produce truth effects in their language and discourse - I discuss my shifting thinking at this point more fully in chapter 2. I was asking what are the knowledges and practices that they are collaborating over and what are the metaphors that reveal those? So, as I discuss in chapter 9, I had begun to read about and play with metaphor. I was aware at this point of my persisting tendency to be normative and to jump to conclusions or implications. While trying to stop myself doing it, I began to talk about this, writing it in to in my reflexive asides throughout the thesis. My data episode was, at this point, transcription rather than metaphor led - a trace of my linguist-self's practices.

Although by this point I felt that my analysis was sound and that most of the metaphors seemed to be working, I sensed that I had a problem of presentation if others were to understand my analysis. I was now aware that I needed to take people more carefully

through the metaphors as the devices which construct the collaborative relationship. I needed to re-organize chapter 9 to signal more clearly to readers what the devices are and then show how they work by introducing the different metaphors and then taking the reader through them - otherwise I risked losing the reader. I was also aware at this time of the density of my writing and how it might come over as repetitive, lofty or convoluted and switch people off - a problem that was different from my on-going problem of reification. I address some of these questions of the difficulties in reading my account in the final version of my analysis in chapter 9; and in a reflexive aside I point up the density of my text in dealing with these complex ideas.

Spring/summer 2003

In my third (and final) attempt at analysis in chapter 9 I have let go a little of my early thinking and research practices that sought to burrow to the real - although my tendency to reify discourses and policy still frames how I think and know things and I signal this at points throughout the thesis. I had learnt to let go of my normative and narrow earlier forms of analysis, which are depicted in chapter 7, and now, more interestingly, sought to explore the workings of the power relationships.

In the final version of chapter 9 I am seeking metaphors at play and opening up to question participants' moves and manoeuvres around them. I foreground the mobilizing strategies of the participants and talk about the bits in the participants' talk which shifts power in the relationships - the Foucauldian agonistic struggles which I mention in the section of Foucault's tools in chapter 2. From my readings I knew that my data was full

of these little manoeuvres by the participants. In the final version of my analysis in chapter 9, I show the different ways in which the individuals struggle with each other and how they create, undermine and transgress identities and relationships. In the final version of chapter 10 I look at the five dimensions of power and showing how the strategies of the participants mobilize power. In chapters 9 and 10 I focus on a discussion of what these people do to the relationships and their 'selves' in their talk. By this point I accept the view that whatever collaboration is it is discursive (to paraphrase Lather, 1991). In my analysis in chapter 9 I view metaphors as the discursive habits into which people have been previously schooled and as the discursive resources which people have at their disposal to construe and depict their discursive realities.

In the final analysis (chapter 9), having uncovered metaphors, I analyse participants' moves and manoeuvres around the metaphors as they actively and energetically, as speaking subjects within collaboration discourses, take-up transient, ambivalent positions which construct and reconstruct their multiple and shifting identities in relation to the dimensions of power. According to MacLure (2003) their 'identity is never fully 'there', but always subject to shifts and ambiguity' (128). I accept that in my reading decisions, even as I reveal undecidabilities, ambiguities and double messages, I momentarily 'fix' participants' multiple, complex and ambiguous identities, their diffuse and mutable selves. As I discuss much more fully in my reflexive aside in chapter 9, my research shifted over time in many ways from its starting points of seeking methodological tools which would provide direct access to reality (chapter 3a); and my

early essentializing and reductive attempts to, for example, classify participants' knowledge bases according to disciplinary mappings (chapter 7).

My developing reflexivity throughout this process and my doing of this research has introduced further data for analysis at points throughout the thesis text. I have continuously examined my writings as data which depict my pre-positions and shifting positions with the changes in my thinking as a result of the research. Disentangling these shifts, changes, indeterminacies, irrationalities and ignorances has, I hope, brought some order to the necessarily messy and disordered.

15th October 2003

I submit my thesis.

CHAPTER 4

WHAT'S BEEN WRITTEN: THE DISCURSIVE EFFECTS

In reviewing the literature, I attempted to critique the relevant texts from educational policy, notions of 'the professional' and of collaboration. This reflected my methodological decision to focus on the social and cultural context of teacher and therapist collaboration relationships in school-based language support provision and on participants' discourses about their collaboration behaviour and experiences. The methodological decision concerning the social and cultural context for this study had implications for decisions about the relevant policy context on which to draw as discussed below. In this research I drew upon the recent layers of literature from a variety of substantive areas, policy studies, models of professional and its related conceptual framework, and theoretical models of collaboration. The three main areas of the literature which provided important conceptual tools for this research - the policy context, changing conceptualizations of 'professional' and the notion of collaboration - are discussed in this chapter.

Why critique mainly school policy?

The cultural context in which the collaboration power relationship is explored in this study is that of school-based provision and the research is concerned with the work of teachers and therapists in schools. Armstrong (2003) asserts that 'values, discourses and social practices can only be understood within the framework of particular spaces and their cultures at particular times' (114). In the approach taken in this research, the

collaboration power relationship is explored in the specific historical contingencies of three school sites. The 'contested terrain' (Ozga, 2000) of the school policy which currently seeks to govern the co-practice of teachers and therapists in these sites is foregrounded for analysis. My concern in this research is with how teachers and therapists do collaboration in practice, the multiple manifestations of 'enacted policy' (Armstrong, 2003, 40) in the co-practice spaces of these individuals.

The RCSLT (1996) policy statements endorsed and legitimated the practice of therapists working in schools and established the standards of practice for SLT practitioners in school language support settings. This analysis, drawing on Foucault's notion of governmentality, is concerned with the operation of power in school institutions. It questions the functioning of collaboration policy to control school-based practitioners 'at a distance' (Hursh, 2003, 46). Such an analysis explores what school authorities 'wanted to happen, in relation to problems defined how, in pursuit of what objectives, through what strategies and techniques?' (Rose, 1999, cited in Hursh, 2003, 46). Therefore, with the exception of that RCSLT policy, the policy documentation examined and critiqued here is mainly drawn from the relevant education policy and legislative frameworks rather than those of health.

Ball (cited in Gale, 2003, 166) speaks of how 'policy technologies', for example standards, features of good practice and evaluation indicators, operate to construct the 'assumptive worlds' of professional practitioners. Gale (ibid.) asserts that:

These worlds...are constituted by related sets of norms, values and attitudes... policy is not only an agent for generating...change but also...it is seen as being responsible for establishing a framework of legitimacy for professional identity and practice style (166).

This analysis sought to examine how school site collaboration 'policy technologies' (ibid. 166) controlled therapists' and teachers' values, practices, subject positions and professional identities at a distance.

Collaboration: the focus of this research

This work was concerned with interprofessional collaboration between language support teachers and speech and language therapists (SLTs) working in the institutional context of school-based provision for children with language and communication disorders. The norms of policy of collaborative teamwork between language support teachers and SLTs were substantially reconceptualized in important ways in the discourses of HMI report (1996). That report introduced the notion of 'productive collaboration' (33), the hallmarks of which are 'mutual trust and respect, joint goal setting, joint training and parental satisfaction with the provision' (33).

This research explored the effects of that policy and others upon the 'collaboration' practices and concerns of individual teachers and therapists. For example, the HMI report (ibid.) draws on the knowledge produced in earlier research undertaken by Reid et al (1996). SOEID (1996b) also drew on Reid et al's (1996) construction of the norms

of practice of the language support teacher and speech and language therapist. It was relevant and important to read and question the history of layers of policy texts relevant to language unit provision. Critical reading of the models of teachers and SLTs' collaborative work held by policy makers and underpinning the policies developed, informed this analysis of the effects of policy discourses on practitioners' values, purposes, attitudes and feelings about practice.

The relationship between policy and its effects on practice and individuals, considering for example, what function the policy serves, its meaning for professionals' practice, provision culture and individuals' selves, was attended to in the research. This work explored how, for example, policy texts worked to undermine the practices which individuals adhered to by their circulation of modified and mutating discourses about 'productive' practices in the language provision institution, a social context with particular histories, discourses and subjectivities. Such analyses informed attempts at critique of the impact of the policy and its influence on how professionals think, act and feel about their collaborative practice in their school-based provision.

The particular discourses introduced in collaboration policy statements are the means by which policy writers seek to produce particular restructuring effects on professional practice. The current proliferation of discourses re-defining joint work practice in the setting requires that each new policy be closely by the practitioners to attempt to unpick and question the assumptions of its discourses for practice. Through such an unsettling response to policy-practice, by choosing to 'complicate the relations *between* them'

(Stronach and MacLure, 1997, 5; original emphasis), teachers and therapists might insert their voices and values into contemporary collaboration practice.

Outline of this chapter

There are three main strands in this review of the literature: the policy context, conceptualizations of 'professional' and its related terms and notions of collaboration. I begin this chapter with an introduction to my reading of the key ideas in the HMI report (1996). This will be followed by a definition of 'policy' and a consideration of new characterizations of 'professional' collaborative practice for the work of teachers and school-based speech and language therapists as described in the SOEID manual (1998). I will explore the extent to which government thinking about interprofessional collaboration has changed and will challenge notions of policy as a tool of a policy-making elite. I will suggest that a more complex model of the connection between policy discourse and professionals' practice is helpful in understanding the present changes in the joint working of therapists and teachers.

A view of 'discourse'

As I outlined in chapter 2 and chapter 3a, the term discourse has many theoretical meanings and usages in different disciplinary contexts. Examining the shift in thinking concerning discourse/practice that was introduced in Foucault's analyses, Rajchman (1985) first describes the traditional model of critique as focused on ideology:

Ideology is the body of irrational belief that stands between us and our 'enlightened' or true interests. It is a form of power or domination which is not violent or based on force, but which prevents us from freely pursuing those interests. To demystify an ideology is therefore to discover our true interests and assume our role in history. (85).

Discussing Foucault's work, Rajchman (ibid.) speaks of Foucault's:

departure from ideology as the focus of critique [and] move towards a minute analysis of the practices that make particular forms of experience historically possible (86).

Rajchman (ibid.) further asserts that, for Foucault, discourse:

is not a lore of belief that might be held as a coherent whole by a single informant, but is many people talking at once in conflicting ways (87).

This research is concerned with the effects of discourse and, in particular, how the discourses of government texts influence a new way of thinking about interprofessional, interagency working.

Mills (1997) challenges the notion of texts containing a unified discourse viewing the text as:

troubled by undercurrents from a range of different discourses allows us to read the text as containing destabilising elements, rather than being simply a powerful tool (119).

In this research I was concerned to examine the relevant texts to explore their gaps, silences, contradictions and inconsistencies in relation to their surface discourse of collaboration.

Strand 1: policy documentation discourses

Policy may refer to what public agencies or government departments do. Policy can mean a set of experts' recommendations or objectives for an activity; it can mean the guiding principles of practice. In one perspective according to Colebatch (1998) policy:

is seen as a way of bringing state power to bear on particular problems and "policy" is the outcome (2).

Further, Colebatch (ibid.) views the processes and effects of policy as work that:

takes place across organizational boundaries ... and consists in the structure of understandings and commitments among participants in different organizations as well as the hierarchical transmission of authorized decisions within any one organization (39).

These understandings of policy provided some of the early conceptual tools for this research as I explored the work of HMI and SOEID/SEED government statements attempting to bring a particular order to the documentations' discourses about the working relationship between teachers and speech and language therapists in schools.

The series of policy documentation concerned with teacher/therapist collaboration, which has emerged in Scotland from 1996 to 2003, has objectivised the notion of teacher/therapist collaboration within a particular context of practice and theory. Collaboration became an object of knowledge and practice subject to essentializing norms and to the ideal of 'productive' (HMI, 1966, 33) collaboration. The discourses of economic productivity are used to justify intervention into the work relationship of teachers and therapists. The series of relevant policy statements have sought to apply new thinking to control the issue of collaboration, establishing a new and different body of knowledge, discourses and practice to what teachers and therapists do. For example, the policy writers 'exercise control at a distance' (Hursh, 2003, 47) through the tactics of accountability and evaluation. One effect of the policy discourses was the tactical institution of evaluation norms with which to sort school-based teachers and therapists, grouping them as effective collaborators or otherwise. That effective/ineffective collaborator binarism is of interest in the present research.

HMI report: (1994) Effective Provision for Special Educational Needs (EPSEN) established the notion of effective practice in working with other professionals as one

of the distinctive features in ensuring 'effective' (ibid. title page) provision for special educational needs. It is perhaps that EPSEN (1994) model of professionalism that HMI (1996) have the knowledge/power to introduce in language support site policy discourses. Their position is perhaps similar to that theorized by Nixon, Martin, McKeown and Ranson (1997) concerning the new context of altered social and power relations between teachers and their publics. Nixon et al (ibid.) invoke a conceptualization of teacher professionals 'accommodating difference and developing integrative modes of agreement making' (16) within which:

the professionalism of the teachers focuses upon the complex practices of agreement making, such that collegiality, negotiation, co-ordination and partnership may be seen as emergent values informing the various fields of teacher professionalism (16).

A Manual of Good Practice in Special Educational Needs (SOEID, 1998) identified features of good practice when working with health service professionals, including speech and language therapists, and provided guidance on the implementation and evaluation of the practice. The analysis of changing notions of interprofessionalism as presented in these policy documents has significance for the professions of teaching and speech and language therapy within and perhaps beyond the Scottish context.

The Scottish Consultative Council on the Curriculum publication: Support for Learning, Part 3, No. 7, Developing the Curriculum for Pupils with Language and

Communication Disorders (SCCC, 1999) might be read as a national level 'strategic response' to the policy recommendation of teacher / therapist collaboration. In that text, interprofessional collaboration discourses have migrated into curriculum development support materials. The aim of this text was to develop the 'effective' practice of 'teachers in mainstream, special schools or language units who work in teaching and supporting these pupils' (ibid. 4). The text speaks of collaborative 'teamwork between teachers and speech and language therapists and interprofessional partnership and co-operation' (ibid. 7). Drawing on HMI's (1996) recommendations, it assumes a norm of collaborative approaches between teachers and therapists guiding all assessment, planning, teaching and therapy, recording, reporting and evaluation.

The HMI report (ibid.) stated that:

in order to facilitate ... productive collaboration ... school and speech and language therapy managers needed to actively promote collaborative working practices in their respective policies (33).

These macro level policy recommendations have migrated into the meso level policy of local education authorities and again migrated and mutated in the micro level policy and practice of schools and language unit provision.

The SOEID (1998) text: A Manual of Good Practice in Special Educational Needs, identifies features of good practice in working with health service professionals,

including SLTs, and provides guidance on their implementation and evaluation. SOEID identified the following 'features [or norms] of good practice' (ibid. 34; my parenthesis) in working with health services: 'services work together to develop flexibility in approaches to meeting the special educational needs of children/young people' (34). Further, it prescribed that:

Professional staff from relevant services involved in multi-disciplinary assessment of children and young persons share their respective approaches to the assessment and identification of special educational needs with each other, the parents and, where appropriate, the child/young person (ibid. 34).

In SOEID (1998), the HMI report's (1996) recommendations are stated as 'features [or new norms] of good practice' (1998, ix; my parenthesis) concerning the theme of 'guidance and support procedures for collaborative working' (ibid. 33). SOEID further recommends that:

Quality services for meeting special educational needs are supported by strategic policies, effective planning and resource allocation ... and by a structure which establishes procedures for monitoring and evaluating the services provided for children and young persons (ibid. 33).

Prevailing collaboration policy discourses

The prevailing government constructions of collaboration were manifested in SOEID (1998) which essentialized partnership and collaboration as a 'Principle of Good Practice' (ibid. viii). The discourses of interagency partnership and collaboration were normalized in that text as an integral dimension of good interprofessional, interagency practice. For example, SOEID (ibid.) prescribes that 'policies for the provision of support for learning state the requirement for collaboration and co-operation among all services and between services and schools' (61) and that:

- Joint and shared training of teachers and staff of specialist support services (including staff managed by other agencies) is organized to extend collaborative working, develop a shared understanding of children's needs and an appreciation of the roles of different professionals (61).

Something of the history of formations of the notion of 'professional' and its related concepts are outlined below. For now, suffice to say that there is in the above statement, a trace invoking previous constructions of 'professionals' as individuals who possess professional knowledge or expertise, skills and technical knowledge available only to those properly inducted into the role and practices of that profession. There is evidence too, of a concern to move professional practice in these institutional settings to the 'shared understanding' characteristic of new professionalism. Professionals were now charged to ensure that other professional groups clearly understand their knowledge base for practice. The 'recommendations' of the HMI report (1996) had

mutated and migrated within SOEID (1998) which sought to reconstruct professional practice in support sites, including language support sites. The new discourses and values of 'collaboration, shared understanding and accountability' replaced those of 'autonomy, knowledge and responsibility' as features of good teacher and therapist professional practice. For school-based speech and language therapists and teacher practitioners, the effects of these new governmentalities included new, changing and uncertain professional practices. For example, there were moves to establish forms of joint training, joint planning and goal setting and partnership with parents.

These new, migrating and mutating policy discourses speak of what 'good' interprofessional, interagency collaborators do and represent what 'effective' co-ordinated working practices and services should be. Changing notions of interprofessionalism, spoken in the official versions represented in policy documentation, have significance for teacher and SLT professionals within the Scottish context. Policy discourse speaks of the extent to which official thinking about interprofessional collaboration has shifted in the key ideas contained in HMI report (1996) and subsequent official documentation statements. The new characterizations of 'professional' collaborative practice contained in the SOEID manual (1998) discourses have implications for the work of teachers and school-based SLTs. School-based interprofessional collaboration policy is a process that needs understanding, commitment and co-operation among teachers and therapists in order to ensure 'effective' implementation.

In conventional systems theory, the relationship of policy to practice is unproblematically viewed as policy subjects (teachers and therapists) receiving the ideas of policy makers for example, HMI, SOEID and the Scottish Office Education Department (SEED), and implementing them in practice completely as intended by their initiators. This 'vertical dimension' (Colebatch, 1998, 37) conceptualization of policy as a tool of a policy-making elite, as a 'top-down' statement of intent in relation to change, was perhaps of limited value in understanding the impact of interprofessional collaboration policy on teachers' and SLTs' practice.

In this research, I was concerned to uncover if the professionals concerned questioned what is meant in government texts by 'good', 'productive' or 'effective' collaborative practice. The notion of policy as 'a tool of a policy-making elite' has been reconceptualized by Colebatch (1998) in terms of a more complex model of the connection between policy discourses and professionals' practice in ways that are more fruitful in understanding the present re-ordering of the joint working of teachers and therapists. Colebatch (ibid.) asserts that:

The players in the game learn how things are done, they learn how the world is viewed, what is regarded as the problem, and what can be done about it. In this respect, occupations are an important source of pattern, and different occupations make sense of the action in different ways (9).

More recent 'horizontal dimension' (ibid. 39) analyses that provide new insights into the complexities and uncertainties of the connections between policy and its impact on practice (see, for example, Ozga, 2000 and Armstrong, 2003) provided more fruitful conceptual tools. In particular, the space for individual professionals' resistance or non-compliance in relation to that particular policy was, as discussed above, of interest in examining the effects of government statements on the collaborative practice of teachers and therapists. I sought instances of practitioners questioning the authoritative definitions of 'good', 'productive' and 'effective' collaborative practice circulated in policy. I attempted to explore participants' counter-discourses and practices that contested authoritative versions of collaboration.

The agendas of concern within the interprofessional collaboration recommendations contained in the HMI report (1996) are, as discussed above, products of the historical discursive formations in the Scottish political and cultural context. Particular preferences, views, values and purposes prevail in the report. Practitioners' responses to the statements spoken in SOEID (1998) were of interest within this research's explorations of the impact of policy on practitioners and their practice.

How teachers and therapists make personal sense of the new official construction of 'quality' collaborative working in relation to their own 'norms' of collaboration beliefs and practices was of interest. This research was concerned to explore, for example, how practitioners responded to these new discourses. I planned to examine how individuals sensed their 'freedom' or power to be diminished, felt excluded from the new practices

of collaboration or felt that these new discourses and practices excluded them from the previous norms of practice with which they identified. I was also interested in individuals' positive identifications with the powerful discourses, the subject positions they took up in relation to them and the ways in which they worked within them.

Policy implementation strategy

The HMI report (1996) identified particular professional groups or organizations to which responsibility for implementing the report's recommendations with respect to professional development and in-service training was delegated. The requirement to promote new practice concerning 'professional development needs' (42) relating to joint working was directed at education authorities. Responsibility to 'develop in-service training courses' (43) was directed at teacher education institutions. The SOEID was charged to:

in conjunction with education authorities and teacher education institutions, consider the in-service and post-graduate training needs of those working with pupils with language and communication disorders (ibid. 43).

By targeting the relevant professional groups at national, local authority and teacher education level, the HMI sought to make certain that the conditions in the context were changed and managed to ensure that the change recommendations made in their report persisted. For example, teachers' training and professional development were changed to include learning about effective interpersonal, interprofessional and interagency

collaborative processes. Continuing professional development opportunities are viewed in policy as one means by which practitioners' conceptualizations of collaboration will be shifted and their words mutated to migrate in different ways into the new legitimized discursive formation.

The effects of official statements

One effect of the recommendations in the HMI report (ibid.) is to frame the agenda of approved practice corresponding to their preferred image of interprofessional collaborative working. The text reconstructs interprofessional practice and establishes implementation and evaluation processes to shift teaching and therapy joint work and to control that practice according to the new authoritative 'standards', 'accountability and 'evaluation' discourses of interagency relations.

The HMI report (ibid.) made important and potentially far reaching recommendations concerning joint in-service and post-graduate training courses intended to develop shared meanings and understandings between teachers and therapists and to work to merge dimensions of the two professions' cultures. Joint postgraduate courses (see, for example, Forbes and Welbon, 2001) are now in place, providing a forum for interprofessional sharing of perspectives and values and working to shift professionals' practice to negotiate and develop co-ordinated collaborative processes. Drawing on post-graduate collaborative practice module evaluation responses, Forbes and Welbon (ibid.) suggest that joint post-graduate and CPD training can work to build the kind of professional confidence and collegial interpersonal relationships based on 'mutual trust

and respect' (HMI, 1996, 33) that the HMI recommendation sought to develop. Such views might suggest that the governmentalities of joint training discourses and the tactics of joint training practice have acted as a positive exercise of power. Further, that joint training discourse/practice has opened up spaces for "the development of individuals' 'dispositions and habits'" (Ransom, cited in Harrison, Clarke, Edwards and Reeve, 2003, 61; original emphasis) of 'mutual trust and respect' (HMI, 1996, 33).

To ensure joint goal setting, SOEID (1998) recommends new 'working practice agreements' (ibid. 34) to co-ordinate the use of human, material and funding resources as an essential feature of good practice:

Where professional staff of different services are working together, working practice agreements are negotiated to clarify roles, responsibilities and accountability (34).

McCartney (1999) recommends the drawing up of school-based service-level agreements. In 2001, Reid and Farmer, a therapist and teacher, gave a presentation at the Scottish Executive's 'Joined-up Working' conference in which they spoke about their joint work to develop a version of such an agreement. Their teacher/therapist evaluation text: *How good is our collaboration?* (2001) provides one example of practitioners' actively taking upon themselves the policy values of accountability and evaluation. Harrison, Clarke, Edwards and Reeve (2003) argue that this kind of self-governmentality is an example of positive power, in Foucault's (1977) terms an active

participation in 'the régime of disciplinary power' (ibid. 182). Harrison et al assert that disciplinary power develops 'capacities, inclinations and dispositions which are seen as more appropriate and productive' (61). Reid and Farmer (2001) do not contest the disciplinary power of evaluation; rather, in producing their evaluation text specific to teacher/therapist collaboration, they seem to have accepted the governmentalities of the discourses of evaluation introduced in SOEID (1996a).

Accommodating change

Therapist and teacher practitioners are working in changing and uncertain joint working contexts. This may have implications for tensions within individuals, between individuals and between the two professional groups and their agencies as they work to adapt practice to accommodate new official policy. Forbes and Welbon (2001) assert that individual practitioners are engaging with the current joint working policy shifts. Therapists and teachers are questioning government documentations' certainties concerning knowledge and practice. Practitioners are working to shape the day-to-day reality of the new emerging versions of professionalism. As 'reflective practitioners' (Schön, 1978), or perhaps as sceptics, they are making personal sense of policy change. Changed professional norms also require that individual practitioners must also change in order to function as 'good' and 'productive' (HMI, 1996, 33) professionals according to those new norms. The new collaborative practice in school-based language provision perhaps requires a shift in individuals' values.

Public service professions' previous values in knowledge, autonomy and responsibility, service, good works and public good have given way in government statements to the institution-focused values of efficiency, quality and accountability and new professionalism's values of agreement-making, collegiality, negotiation, co-ordination and partnership. School-based speech and language therapists and teachers are perhaps presently subject to these values.

Government recommendations and guidance may be viewed as an expression of practices according to a particular ideology. The assumptions at work in policy statements construct and delimit possible ways of working for the practitioners concerned. Practitioners require to question the self-evidence of these systems of thought. The new professionalism will perhaps require interagency agreement-making that takes account of practitioners' questioning at macro (national), meso (local authority) and micro (school) levels to negotiate acceptable new systems, structures and processes. Such agreements might enable practitioners to actively participate, to voice their particular values. Such engagements by teachers and therapists in the discursive practices of agreements might open up as Harrison, Clarke, Edwards and Reeve (2003) suggest 'spaces and opportunities for individuals to adopt their own strategies and negotiate their own positionings' (61).

Reflexive aside: sceptical questioning and critical analysis of government policy statements may enable professionals to understand changing official notions of professionalism and

may empower them to actively participate in the new and shifting context of interprofessional collaboration. Critique of interprofessional policy documents should perhaps help therapists and teachers to appraise the notions of professionalism that are represented and to question their underlying theories, assumptions, values framework and functions. Sceptical questioning and critical analysis might enable practitioners to make personal sense of policy, make considered individual judgements and express their specialist knowledge, opinions, values and interests in response. Thinking and acting in these very particular ways specific to their own knowledge, expertise and practice, teacher and therapist practitioners may perhaps achieve new kinds of professionalism and identities based on 'self-work'.

Strand 2: new conceptualizations of 'professional'

In this section I examine the discourses of interprofessional and interagency collaboration and attempt to grasp the notion of collaboration in the particular educational context. I explore the work of new, authoritative conceptualizations of professional collaboration in restructuring the official model of teacher and SLT professional and their practice. I critique the knowledgeable discourses in government

texts. Further, I question what those discourses do to produce in individuals changed self-subjectifications in their inclinations and dispositions to authoritative notions of productive interprofessional, interagency working. The notion of 'productive' (HMI, 1996, 33) collaboration is tied to powerful discourses of 'economic productivity'. Discussing the discourses that construct the concept of 'productive workers', Hursh (2003) asserts that notions of 'productive' flow from particular powerful constructions of work values:

The primary discourse is that of neo-liberal economic theory. While education policy-makers do not usually provide an explicit economic theory behind their proposals, they do frequently cite the need to respond to global economic competition...neo-liberals desire to increase education's efficiency so that educational costs and, therefore governmental expenditures, can be minimised. Economic growth and corporate profits, rather than other criteria such as quality of life, become the dominant lens through which policy decisions are made (47).

Previous and new characterizations of 'the professional' informed critical reflection on the model of teachers and of SLTs and their joint working practice held by policy-makers and underpinning successive official statements. Foucault's (1977) analysis of the ways in which the notion of criminality and the practices used to punish, manage and control individuals and groups labelled 'criminal' and associated techniques of normalization provided me with tools for critiquing changing notions of 'professional' over time and the ways in which it has been deployed to manage and control

individuals labelled as, or labelling themselves as 'professionals'. Considering the purposes that a particular stated official view of 'professional' serves and its meaning for individuals' practice was a useful conceptual means of developing knowledge and understanding of research participants' personal and professional lived experiences working jointly in language support settings.

'Profession' and its related concepts

The idea of what it means to be a 'professional' and conceptualizations of profession and professionalism have changed over time but have always been symbolic and ideological, invoking implicit assumptions concerning beliefs, values and ethics. Bergen (1988) illustrates how 'ideal-typical' models of professionalism that attempt to measure teaching, or other 'non-archetype' professions such as speech and language therapy, against traditional, 'ideal' or 'archetype' professions like medicine and law are of limited value in examining the 'daily practice, the social reality of the professions' (ibid. 45). However, the criteria distinguishing a profession that are evident in 'ideal-typical' model formulations: autonomy, knowledge and responsibility are central matters for education and therapy. Making personal/professional sense of the concepts of autonomy, knowledge and responsibility are crucial matters for SLTs and teachers. These three concepts were therefore of use in the present examination of the interplay between collaboration policy and its effects for teachers' and SLTs' practice.

Reflexive aside: as my understandings shifted, I became aware that I had previously centralized these characteristics

of collaboration. I sensed that I had been working with them as norms of practice against which I might make judgements. I began to consider them as just some of the powerful discourses which individuals might be aware of, choose to use, or position themselves in relation to.

New norms of professionalism

This research was concerned with the effects of official policy collaboration discourses concerned with reformulating the notion of professionalism to reframe the official model of the therapist-professional and teacher-professional according to new beliefs and values. From the 1960s to the early 1980s, state control of Scottish teachers' work was minimal. Teachers exercised professional self-government. They independently established the norms of their own practice. Teachers controlled the curriculum and the teaching task according to the prevailing government model of 'responsible, autonomous professionalism' (Lawn and Ozga, 1988, 86). The state as employer endorsed a model of professionalism characterized by individual qualified professional practitioners working independently, drawing on a particular disciplinary knowledge base to address the needs of clients and taking personal and professional group responsibility for their actions.

The new conceptualization of collaborative working spoken in the HMI report (1996) and the SOEID manual (1998) challenges the established professional values of

autonomy, knowledge and responsibility. Current Scottish policy assumes that SLT and teacher professionals should develop collaborative working practice to provide an integrated service to user children and families. Such a seamless service is articulated in HMI report (1996) as 'joint goal setting ... and parental satisfaction with the provision' (33).

New discourses concerning ways of teachers and therapists working together are manifested in SOEID (1998). The manual's theme of 'guidance and support procedures for collaborative working' (34) constitutes teacher/therapist collaboration as a systematic pattern of activity. These are the authoritative words and conceptualizations about teachers' interprofessional work which different historical layers of talk about notions of collaboration have produced at the present time. The changed manifestations of interagency collaborative teamwork practice which flow from these new legitimizations for thinking about and performing what the HMI (1996) characterize as 'productive collaboration' were explored in the analysis in chapter 10.

Reflexive aside: introducing the discourses, I suggested that unpicking how therapists and teachers made sense of the professional criteria or norms of authority, knowledge and responsibility would be of interest. I became aware that my position at that point was partly a means to delimit and impose some kind of order on what I was seeking. As the

research continued I began to think about how individuals actively position themselves, constructing positions within the powerful discourses. That was my interest in the empirical work and in my analysis.

The new view of collaborative professionalism

The writers of the HMI report (1996) and the SOEID manual (1998) drew upon a new conceptual and theoretical framework for the professional base of practitioners and for relationships between collaborating professionals and service users around interprofessional co-ordination. The core values of teaching and the norms of professional practice have shifted in this reconceptualization. The most historically recent 'dominant' characterization of the teacher as an autonomous, responsible professional with particular disciplinary knowledge has been replaced by a new, preferred, legitimized discursive formation which views the teacher-professional as a collaborative team-worker with knowledge and skills in effective agreement making, negotiation, co-ordination and partnership. These new personal and professional skills were to underpin therapists' and teachers' practice and actions and their contributions to the development and change of school-based language support provision.

How do the discourses seek to govern the detail of practices? Support for Learning, Part 3, No.7. (SCCC, 1999) recommends that teachers and therapists working together should take an integrative team approach to assessment, planning, programme implementation and evaluation. School-based language support practitioners should

now understand the benefits to parents and children of effective interpersonal, interprofessional and interagency collaboration that produces coherent target setting and curriculum planning with no gaps and no overlap. I would suggest that HMI report (1996) and SOEID (1998) invoke this new conceptualization of professional ways of thinking and acting and assume that these new practices will order the thinking and actions of practitioners involved in relationship between teachers, SLTs and service-users.

Strand 3: collaboration

Talk and writing about 'collaboration' is currently all but ubiquitous in schools in Scotland. Notions of 'collaboration' circulate in documentation and talk in a variety of areas, perhaps most notably it is omnipresent in early intervention, special educational needs and new community schools discourses. The meanings of the talk and writing around the concept of 'collaboration' are many, diverse and at times very slippery and uncertain. It is often used together with the notion of partnership. It is, according to Friend and Cook (2000) 'mistakenly treated ... as a synonym for other concepts such as consultation and teams' (5). It is equated too with the processes of 'teamwork', 'joint working' and the concepts of 'interdisciplinary', 'multidisciplinary', interprofessional and 'multiprofessional' approaches.

Collaboration is articulated in a variety of ways in documentation and in the wider literature in the field. Leathard (2000), offering a table of concept, process and agency based 'alternative terms used variously for inter-professional work' (5), speaks of 'a

terminological quagmire' (5). One influential metaphor is that of 'the system' (see, for example, McCartney, MacKay, Cheseldine and McCool, 1998). Collaboration is in many texts conceptualized as 'working together' or 'working with' in the sense of professional practitioner working with professional practitioner (see, for example, Bastiani, 1989, Hornby and Atkins, 1993, Leathard, 2000). Collaboration can also constitute 'working-with' either in the sense of individual practitioners from different professional groups co-working, of two professional groups working together (Wright and Graham, 1997) or, in the sense of practitioners 'working with' a particular difficulty or group of difficulties (Leathard, 2000). A related notion is that of 'working for' (ibid. 2000) which attends to the practices of the professionals involved in relation to the individual service-user. These notions signal the specific practice relationship which is of interest and foregrounded for analysis.

Collaboration is variously conceptualized as an 'approach' (Hornby and Atkins, 1993, Fleming, Miller and Wright, 1997, McCartney, 1999a), whether 'team', 'integrated' or 'integrative'. It is viewed as a 'style' (Friend and Cook, 2000). Collaboration is constituted as a specific 'provision' (Law, Lindsay, Peacey, Gascoigne, Soloff, Radford and Band, 2001, Paradice and Adewusi, 2002). It is talked of as a 'response', an 'intervention' or a 'service' (see, for example, New, 1998, Law et al, 2001).

Characterized as a 'service', it is presented in terms of a particular type of service that is 'integrated', 'child-centred', 'parent and child centred', 'family-centred' or 'user-centred'. Other metaphors express 'crossing' and 'divides' (Daines in Miller, 1992) or 'alliance' (Hornby and Atkins, 1993), notions applied at personal, professional and agency levels.

Another metaphorization is 'we' (and they) (McCartney and van der Gaag, 1996) presented in a discussion of programme evaluation. Collaboration is conceptualized as being 'in', that is, putative work done in a particular place (Daines in Miller, 1992, Martin and Miller, 1996) and/or in the sense of a particular professional or professional group working 'in' another, a non-own, agency (Millar and Reid, 1996, Fleming, Miller and Wright, 1997).

Interagency collaboration discourses

There has been much research concerning interprofessional, interagency working for health and social care (see for example, Hornby and Atkins, 1993, Leathard, 2000, Mathias and Thompson, 1997, Loxley, 1997). Many studies, as Farmakopoulou's (2002) research confirms, have been concerned with collaboration between health and social work. Farmakopoulou discusses three models of education/social work interagency collaboration. She discusses 'social exchange theory, power/resource dependency and political economy' (ibid. 50-51) conceptualizations and argues that further studies should integrate these three perspectives (ibid. 49). I would suggest that what might be said is that these discourses of 'social exchange, power/resource dependency and political economy' may be drawn upon in health/education discourses and documentation or by individual practitioners with certain effects in the practice relationship of therapists and teachers.

Education/health interagency collaboration discourses

MacKay, McCartney, McCool and Cheseldine (1995) use a systems theory model as an approach to education/health service evaluation and measurement of therapists' and teachers' work. This approach was adapted by McCartney et al (1998) to attend to the system at three levels: environment, process and functions/structures. McCartney (1999a) recommends the application of systems theory to understand 'how' services and agencies interact and prescribes a multidimensional model for programme effectiveness evaluation. Systems theory, which draws upon positivist methodology and 'objective' methods, does not seek to explore the operation of power/knowledge at work in the system, for example, that it views individuals reductively as objects in the system (Lechte, 1994), nor does systems theory address the highly political nature of decision-making that constitutes and delimits the matters of interest in specific programme evaluations (Anderson and Arsenault, 1998).

There is a growing amount of research concerned with the national (macro) and local education authority/ health trust (meso) levels of interagency collaboration. There is much research that addresses collaboration's strategic implications at interagency level (for example, Reid et al, 1996, Dyson, Lin and Milward, 1998, Law, Lindsay, Peacey Gascoigne, Radford, Band and Fitzgerald, 2000, Law et al, 2001).

Law et al's (2000) study was commissioned by a speech and language therapy working group established by the then Department of Employment, the Department of Health and the Welsh Assembly. Law et al examined existing provision for all children with

speech and language needs in England and Wales. Law et al (2001) state that an additional aim of the study was to 'help facilitate the process of collaboration between health and education services' (133). Law et al (2000) make eighteen 'recommendations' or 'prescriptions' (Lyotard, 1984, 10), many of which recommend the need for 'enhanced collaboration at a range of levels' (Law et al, ibid. 133).

Therapist/teacher interprofessional collaboration discourses: agreements

Since 1996, there has been a growing literature with a focus on the 'effective' therapist/teacher relation (for example, Martin and Miller, 1996, Kersner and Wright, 1996, Fleming, Millar and Wright, 1997). Some of this research is concerned with promoting 'effective' therapist/teacher collaboration relations at each stage of the Individualized Education Programme (IEP) processes through its stages: referral, assessment, teaching/therapy, recording, reporting, evaluation and reintegration/discharge.

As discussed above, an emerging theme in the teacher/therapist working relationships literature has been that of 'service level contracts', 'working practice agreements' or 'school-based, service level agreements' (HMI, 1996, Reid et al 1996, SOEID, 1998, McCartney, 1999a, Reid and Farmer, 2001). A 'key recommendation' of HMI (1996) directed at headteachers and teachers in charge of units was that they should:

establish with the speech and language therapist and the speech and language therapy manager, a service level contract specifying what is expected from the speech and language therapist and what is expected from the school (42).

The literature and recent government policy documentation concerning 'agreements' is perhaps reductively centrally concerned with 'efficient' use of human resources rather than with, for example, the discourses of human rights or the user-child's entitlement.

Joint training

A thread in the teacher/therapist collaboration literature has concerned the issue of joint training for teachers and SLTs (HMI, 1996, Luscombe and Shaw, 1996, Law et al, 2000, Law et al, 2001, Forbes and Welbon, 2001). The Joint Professional Development Framework (JPDF) (I CAN, 2001) was the product of a project co-ordinated by I CAN, a national charity for children with speech and language difficulties, and funded by the Department for Education and Skills (DfES). Parents were consulted as part of the JPDF project's 'background research' (Paradice, 2002, 4) and the project outcomes and the JPDF document's contents were widely disseminated through three I CAN sponsored conferences.

The JPDF document (I CAN, 2001) assumes that the direction and structured and hierarchical standards of a framework are the answers to the 'patchy' nature of provision identified by Law et al (2000). Paradice (2002) suggests a number of other uses for the framework document, recommending that:

providers of training will incorporate the framework into their existing training schemes. We also anticipate that the framework document will be used as an audit tool for individual teachers and SLTs ...also...as a resource (5).

The JPDP (I CAN, 2001) develops and orders in a particular way the notions of 'training', 'audit' and 'evaluation of practice' introduced in earlier policy documentation. The JPDP standardized and hierarchized norms of 'training' in pre-designated technical work content and evaluation or 'audit' of performance in relation to the stated evaluation indices. The discourses enunciated on the JPDP might be read as those specifying joint CPD and evaluation/assessment. The Framework institutes a hierarchy of qualifications relating to the areas and levels of 'professional competence' required of teacher and therapist professionals.

Evaluation

There is much evaluation research attempting to measure the 'effectiveness' of provision (for example, van der Gaag, 1995, McCartney and van der Gaag, 1996, SOEID, 1996a, Reid and Farmer, 2001). McCartney and van der Gaag (1996) conclude that there is a need to develop small-scale solutions to problems of evaluation to be used in complex situations by informed practitioners. McCartney and van der Gaag (1996), building on van der Gaag's (1995) work, are concerned to:

define appropriate methods and mechanisms for evaluating therapy practice ...
and to provide a critique of the complex implications ... of the current emphasis
on demonstrating effectiveness in public services (315).

How SLTs are to be judged is considered and the solution of a multi-dimensional systems evaluation framework is prescribed to investigate 'effectiveness' through outcomes that can be measured. The difficulties inherent in models that attempt to produce knowledge that can 'measure' effectiveness (see, for example, Shaw, 1988) remain unspoken. Shaw identifies an inherent difficulty in applying rational, scientific systems thinking and approaches to ethically and politically complex organizations such as schools.

Reflexive aside: a number of the tools used to understand collaboration seem to essentialize 'ideals' of collaboration (see, for example, RCSLT, 1996 and HMI, 1996) or classify the 'norms' of collaboration (see, for example, Marvin, and diMeo et al, in McCartney, 1999). Further, I began to think that there was 'something going on' in the 'evidence' that was 'valued' and 'valorized' in much of the collaboration research. From my reading, I knew that much of the work used a limited range of analytical tools. It seemed that the thinking and methods of 'objective' social science delimited

the toolkit embraced and used to grapple with 'collaboration'. I began to question the dominance of the operation of social-science power/knowledge in relation to 'theorizing collaboration'. In Foucauldian terms, how do these ways of thinking and acting, 'discursive formations' (Foucault, 2000c, 31-39), order possible ways of thinking 'collaboration'? I began to question the apparent innocence of these rather narrow research practices, which privileged specific tools and techniques and excluded others as unacceptably 'subjective' and non-scientific.

Collaboration metaphors

An example of recent influential statements and writing about collaboration, utilizing a number of related metaphors to develop the argument, is McConkey's 2001 Gulliford Lecture and subsequent published paper. The rationale for education joining forces with health and social services is, according to McConkey (2002):

inclusion within society and the right to a full and decent life...it is both inefficient and uneconomical to be travelling on our own road when there is another one we should be taking that could make all the difference (7).

McConkey (2002) mobilizes a variety of figures of roads: old and new, less and more travelled, and long and freeway, new avenues for joint working, and bridges in his discussion of 'reciprocal working by health and social services' (3). McConkey's paper suggests that the health and social services draw upon certain of the strategies successfully developed by education to overcome children's learning disabilities. He proposes that approaches, skills and strategies used in schools and classrooms, outlined by him as: 'functional assessments, learning goals, learning methods, evaluating progress, accredited learning' (4-5), should have wider applicability to social services.

The new avenues that bring together professionals from different disciplines highlighted by McConkey are: early intervention, statutory assessments, Statements, the annual review process and transition planning. For McConkey, considering whether joint working around each of these aspects really occurs in practice serves as 'a reminder of the lack of bridges on these new roads' (5). McConkey claims that there are 'roads but no bridges' (5) due to: professionals' limited cognisance of the child's and family's social world beyond their professional domain of school or clinic, uni-disciplinary management, funding and career structures; and internal agency pressures and priorities which leave little energy for building bridges across agency boundaries. McConkey summarizes some 'blueprints for building bridges across service systems' (6): a focus on working with families and communities, individual family plans, out-of-school learning, merging staff roles and reorganizing services. He proposes 'creating new freeways' (6) exemplified as: the school as a community resource with varied functions, multi-skilled personnel and common management to be researched and

evaluated by 'broad strategies' of: developing model projects, evaluating new styles of services and longitudinal studies.

There is much in McConkey's detailed working out of his chosen conceptualizations that is of interest in problematizing the present research. However, his use of the 'travel' or roads group of metaphors perhaps expresses an enlightenment concern with linear progression. Perhaps too the static quality of the bridge metaphor, only spanning or crossing the linear professional paths at intervals, operates to ossify the notion of 'reciprocal working' (ibid. 3) rather than opening views of 'professionalism' to questioning and re-thinking.

In McConkey's conceptualization, bridgings are foci for services working and planning together and new work roles and service structures. The idea of 'blueprints' (ibid. 6) perhaps expresses a technicist concern with ability to draw quite specific and generalizable conclusions about the situation, suggesting a response, recommending or prescribing efficient and economical models, which can be unproblematically replicated. But, in my dissonant reading, this does not address the conceptual difficulties and perhaps theoretical inadequacies of the chosen group of metaphors. At another level, the tensions in McConkey's attempt to achieve completeness in his work to view and structure his analysis totally coherently through such a group of related metaphors suggests a particular 'objectivist' view of the world.

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) argue that:

The way that a consistent set of metaphors imposes an entity structure with a set of relations between the entities can be represented by an objectivist model. In the model, the entities are those imposed by the ontological metaphors, and the relations between the entities are those given by the internal structures of the structural metaphors. ... Trying to structure a situation in terms of such a consistent set of metaphors is in part like trying to structure that situation in terms of an objectivist model (220).

From their 'experientialist myth' worldview, Lakoff and Johnson go on to argue that: 'What is left out are the experiential bases of the metaphors and what the metaphors hide' (220). This has resonance with Foucault's (1972) argument for new tools for analysis that do not seek to establish totality and synthesis but provide 'concepts that enable us to conceive of discontinuity (threshold, rupture, break, mutation, transformation)' (5).

My experiences of examining how the issue of collaboration has been and is cast have involved an unending grappling with metaphors that differentiatedly provide a take on some aspect of its discontinuities and transformations. My grapplings with the data concerning the term 'collaboration' perhaps attempt the beginnings of an unravelling. Derrida's writings concerning deconstruction tell us that all of our concepts are indeterminate and incomplete and that no definitive account of a concept can be produced. Attention to metaphor in any reading of a text offers a means of taking into

account the different, multiple discursive resources around collaboration which individuals draw upon, and how individuals choose to deploy particular collaboration metaphors in specific contexts.

Grappling with collaboration: using metaphor as a tool

Friend and Cook (2000) metaphorize collaboration as a 'style'. They define the concept of collaboration:

Interpersonal collaboration is a style for direct interaction between at least two coequal parties voluntarily engaged in shared decision making as they work toward a common goal (6).

In this definition, they metaphorize collaboration as 'human exchange' (xi), a figure which perhaps problematizes the concept of collaboration in the psychological terms of shared understandings and meanings. The rationale for Friend and Cook's metaphorization of collaboration as a new mode of 'human exchange' (xi) is that such a conceptualization is appropriate to the present 'social order' (xi) where:

Social agencies are told they must collaborate to provide wraparound services for children and families; workers and management find collaboration necessary for survival. ... collaboration is a step up in democratic process, going beyond compromise and co-operation to shared understanding and shared meaning in

decision making. ... It is a transformation, but in keeping with the democratic ethos (xi).

Friend and Cook (ibid.) justify their conceptualization of collaboration using an interpersonal 'style' metaphor in that:

using this term enables you to distinguish the nature of the interpersonal relationship, that is, collaboration, occurring during shared interactions from the activities themselves, for example, teaming or problem solving (6).

Metaphorizing collaboration as a 'style' resonated with my developing thoughts and understandings in readings of participants' collaborations as different styles of jazz improvisations around the collaborative practice performance conventions, different individuals' treatment of and response to enactment of policy demands, different individual and pairs' jazz fusions. Dexter and La Magdeleine (2002) discuss Oldfather and West's application of a jazz metaphor in an analysis of qualitative research:

For them, jazz serves as a rich metaphor for thinking about the nature of qualitative research because of its deft combination of predictable strategies and improvisation (363).

Collin (1998) analyses the way forward for counsellor practitioners and suggests that:

A more appropriate metaphor might be that of playing jazz. Jazz players improvise but are not anarchic. They are disciplined, skilled, creative and intuitive. They make music in relational, collaborative and non-hierarchical ways (89).

Metaphorizing collaboration as 'jazz play' may produce imaginative and creative, kinds of metaphors which Lakoff and Johnson (1980) suggest are 'capable of giving us a new understanding of our experience' (139).

Reflexive aside: in my thinking above, although I was no longer searching after one true meaning of collaboration, I continued to want to know what the multiplicity of metaphors used to speak of collaboration might suggest about it. I continued to hope that all these notions might tell me something about what collaboration is. My position shifted and instead I became interested in what collaboration does. I wanted to find out how collaboration discourses work and how individuals took up some of the discourses and exploited their discursive effects.

In chapter 9, I explore the use of metaphor by individuals as they actively collaborate in their partnership meeting talk. Thereafter, the metaphors which I uncovered are discussed below in chapter 10 in my analysis of the data. In chapter 5 which follows, I introduce the three research sites and the teachers and therapists who participated in this research.

CHAPTER 5

GETTING TO KNOW THEM: THE RESEARCH SITES AND PARTICIPANTS

I now introduce the participants and three research sites; and then, drawing on excerpts from the empirical material, the participants introduce themselves and their school settings in their own words. I carried out the empirical research in three primary school sites: Inverian, Glenian and Benian. A detailed account of the methodological decisions is contained in chapter 3a and I am concerned in what follows in this chapter to describe the way in which the three different contexts were encountered and managed. I viewed myself as an insider researcher in this work as I had previously, as a peripatetic teacher of language impaired children, been based at Inverian Language unit for four years during which time I also worked peripatetically in Glenian and Inverian. I had historical practitioner knowledge and experience of the day-to-day lived experiences of teacher and therapist practitioners in the three school settings which I drew on in my attempts to analyse individual's positions and identifications. I gathered written text and semi-structured interview data from six participants, three teacher/therapist partnership pairs in each of the three school sites. The partners' meeting data included the account of a seventh participant, Anna Powell, a teacher, who job-shared with Orla Marshall, a teacher at Inverian language unit.

During summer 2000, written permission for access to the Inverian, Glenian and Benian school sites for the purposes of my research was sought and granted from the relevant local authority directors of education. During autumn 2000, I sought, and was

granted, written permission for access for research purposes from the headteachers of the three schools. I then sent letters seeking their participation in this research to six potential participants who had attended a postgraduate course on collaborative working by teachers and speech and language therapists which I co-teach with a speech and language therapist colleague. All six agreed to participate. I also sought the permission of the pathway director of the higher education institution which provided the course to seek the participants' agreement to the release of their course assignment texts to be used as data in this research.

The data for this research was gathered by three methods: formal written texts, audiotaped semi-structured interview accounts and audiotaped partners' meeting talk in which I did not participate and was not present. During February 2001, I piloted my interview schedule with Sara Holm the assistant headteacher at Inverian language unit. I also piloted my own handling of all of the other interview processes and interpersonal and technical demands in the interview with Sara. I then transcribed and attempted initial readings of the data which I had gathered from Sara's interview. The interview schedule questions seemed to have been sufficiently open to collect data relevant to my research questions and provide openings for Sara to voice her perspectives on wider collaboration matters.

I then negotiated times and venues for the semi-structured interviews with the six individuals who had agreed to participate. I visited each school to discuss the purposes of my research, to seek participants' agreement in writing to the use of their written

texts for research purposes, to carry out the six individual interviews and to leave the audiotapes to be used by partners to gather their meeting accounts. Either when we met at the semi-structured interviews or by post, I asked all six participants to sign a form of consent for their course assignment texts to be used by me as data in my research. I fully discussed the demands on participants of my third method of data collection, the partners' meetings, when I was at the school sites to carry out the interviews. I also left with the participants at each site a blank ninety minute audio-tape and stamped self-addressed padded envelope for return of the tape.

I recorded, fully transcribed and analysed the six individual semi-structured interviews with participants. I also asked the participants to record their partners' meeting and I then fully transcribed and analysed the three audiotaped accounts. In addition to the accounts of collaborative working in participants' written and spoken texts, I sourced and examined the relevant central government, local authority and school provision policy documents. I critiqued all the relevant national policy documentation and I discuss my readings of the policy documentation in my review of the literature in chapter 4.

Inverian

Inverian primary school language unit is a long-established education service provision for children with language and communication disorders. The language unit emerged from an earlier, pre-Warnock, hearing impairment/language provision in Inverian. Inverian is a large, multi-ethnic inner-city community primary school with a separate

hearing impairment unit and community provision including support for children and their parents for English as an additional language.

The language unit is situated within the main school building at the extreme end of a corridor wing in which the other classrooms are used for art and general purposes. The unit has two classroom spaces. The main work and life of the unit occurs in one large, shared open space and the second room is used by the unit children and staff for general purposes such as art and music and, for example, for speech games and testing. Prior to the empirical work at Inverian the unit's main room space was opened-up and made open plan by the practitioners by removing storage dividers. The unit's main room is shared and used by the children, teachers, full-time speech and language therapists and all visiting parents and professionals. The unit capacity is fifteen pupils, mainly nursery and early years stage children. There are three full-time teacher posts in the unit, a full-time assistant headteacher, a full time senior teacher and a job-shared unpromoted teacher post.

The participants in this research from Inverian primary school language unit are Caro Gillon-Fife, the principal speech and language therapist, and Orla Marshall and Anna Powell, the unit's teachers who job-share the full-time unpromoted post. Caro is based full-time year-round at the language unit, including outwith school terms when the children are on holiday. Orla is the more experienced language support teacher, Anna having come to this work fairly recently when the opportunity became available to share what had been Orla's full-time post.

Glenian

Glenian primary school is the largest primary school within the local authority area of South Strathianshire. It is the local neighbourhood school within what was historically a market town and is now a very popular commuter town for Strathian City. At the time of the empirical work for this research, a new special educational needs nursery had been built as an extension to the two existing nurseries, and was being established as the preferred provision for local children with additional support needs.

One of the participants at Glenian is Hannah Hall; a community clinic based speech and language therapist. At the time of the empirical work for this research Hannah was also the acting speech and language therapy adviser for special educational needs. Hannah works with a number of teachers and schools to support children on the speech and language therapy caseload who have also been accepted onto the caseload of the area's peripatetic language impairment service teacher. School provision for some of these children is at the Glenian primary school nursery. Roz Farquahar, the other Glenian participant, is one of the school's nursery teachers. Roz is a mainstream primary school teacher with further qualifications in early years who works with the peripatetic language support teacher and the speech and language therapists to support children in her class.

Glenian nursery's new modular extension can accommodate in-class work or group co-teaching, including movement activities, by any 'visiting specialists' including Hannah.

There are quiet rooms within the Glenian nursery classrooms' setting should Hannah or Roz require a quiet 'extraction' area, for example, for individual speech work, testing or for team meetings or meetings with parents or with other practitioners.

Benian

Benian is a large primary school that shares a community school campus with Benian Academy. The Benian associated schools' group special educational needs base is located in a new purpose-built semi-open-plan three room extension within Benian primary school. The extension has been purposely located on a main school corridor with the two doors to the unit's nursery/early years and middle/upper stages rooms leading off the corridor into the interlinked, light and spacious unit spaces.

One of the participants at Benian special educational needs base is Freya Wildgoose. Freya is one of the base's full-time unpromoted teachers who works with the children in the early years group. Freya is an experienced teacher of children with severe and complex language and communication difficulties. Over many years, she has developed her knowledge of child language development and language acquisition and has acquired knowledge and skills in alternative and augmentative communication including use of Makaton sign system. Ellen Britten, the other Benian participant is a community, clinic-based speech and language therapist. Through the education/health agency level service contract, the local authority education service buys sessions of Ellen's time to work with children with records of needs (statements) which include language needs or who have identified language needs which are non-recorded and are

supported by multi-agency teams. At the time of the empirical work for this research Ellen was just about to return to her post full-time having completed a period of maternity leave.

The large nursery/early years space can accommodate in-class work or group co-teaching, including movement activities, by any 'visiting specialists' including Ellen. There is a quiet room linked to the Benian base nursery/early years classroom should Ellen or Freya require a quiet 'extraction' area for any purpose.

The participants introduce themselves and their settings

In the three sections which follow, the research sites and the research participants are introduced by the participants themselves. Pseudonyms are used throughout.

Participants' quotations are in italics. Although in what follows there may be some repetition of aspects already covered in this chapter, my purpose here is to insert the participants' voices, their descriptions of their collaborative work relations in their specific school settings in their own words.

(a) Benian Primary School Special Educational Needs Base provision of the South Strathianshire Language Development Service

The participants in this research from the above provision are Ellen, speech and language therapist and Freya, SEN Base teacher. Ellen and Freya were invited to participate in this research as they had worked together on a postgraduate module as a 'participant pair'. They had both written assignments for the module and I discussed

with them how their statements in those texts concerning collaboration would be of interest and have relevance to the present work. Both Ellen and Freya subsequently agreed access to their written texts for research purposes.

Ellen and Freya collaborate to support children in a base provision for children within a large mainstream primary school located in a small town. Ellen is the Speech and Language Therapist who works at Benian Primary School to support children in the base with language and communication disorders. She also works for part of her time on a project for *teenagers with Asperger's Syndrome or otherwise socially isolated*. She has worked in school-based language support provision for about six and a half years. Ellen, in interview, described the Benian team membership:

Well there's me, the therapist. Freya Wildgoose, some other teachers Roberta Grebe, Margo Swan. They're all the ones that are involved in the support base. But I tend to work mainly with Freya although I discuss the plans ... as well. And then there's all the class teachers too who are involved in ... but only to a lesser extent.

Ellen, in interview, described how the Benian Base team works:

There's review meetings once a year. That's one thing where all sorts of people come along to. There's planning sessions, that's with Roberta [another base teacher] and Freya. Joint working with an auxiliary for a group and ... I'm also

doing a group with Freya and previously I did one with Roberta and ... And so various other things take place at other times but those are the main ones that I can think of.

Freya is a teacher in Benian Primary School. She has worked in school-based support provision for children with language and communication disorders for *fourteen, fifteen years, maybe more*. Freya has worked in the Benian provision during its change of status from a unit *and part of the school* to a base where *the base teachers aren't necessarily actually going to mainstream a lot*. When asked in interview to describe the Benian Base teacher/SLT team, Freya responded:

Well, a Thursday morning we work together as in a group and we share the session. And after that she's doing individual speech things which I may not necessarily be involved with at all. You know I might not even know what she's doing ... She does come other days. But you've got to remember she's not [just] working with my group. So she could be in the academy or she could be working with older children.

(b) Glenian Primary School provision of the South Strathianshire Language Development Service

The Glenian participants are Hannah, speech and language therapist and Roz, teacher. Hannah and Roz were invited to participate in this research as they had attended the postgraduate 'collaboration' module together. Hannah and Roz work together to support

children with language and communication disorder or delay in the school campus nursery of a large mainstream primary school in a market town.

Hannah is the community clinic based speech and language therapist who works at Glenian primary school with non-recorded children supported by the area language development service. She has been working in the South Strathianshire school-based language support provision for about six and a half years. At the time of the research Hannah was the acting speech and language therapy advisor in special needs. In her interview, Hannah spoke of the way that the Glenian provision collaboration works: *usually I would see the children in the clinic and the teacher would see them in the class.* Again in interview, asked to describe the interprofessional team between SLTs and teachers, she responded:

It's very complicated. ... I work for Straloch Primary Healthcare Trust...

Children are referred to me and are usually seen at the health centre. So that kind of immediately sets you apart from the school. I don't tend to see an awful lot of children in school...But because of the size of the area and everything, the sort of, the team is really quite big depending on who's involved. So for any particular child it could be the class teacher and me, it could be a team like and the parents. That could be one size of team. Or it might include the class teacher, the language development teacher, the speech and language therapist, the parents. There might be learning support... The team varies.

Asked in interview to describe the focus of her work with Roz Farquhar, Hannah replied:

She is the nursery teacher up at the school. And she maybe would have, sort of, five or six children in her nursery that I would be involved with...at differing levels. So there might be children who are just in review. So they are known to me. And again all the children that go into nursery get this pupil profile written for them...So some of them it would just be a case of 'this child's known to me'...but to give us a ring if there's any problems. Other children it would be more a case of 'this child's having regular therapy. This is what we are, you know, working on'. And she might well say 'right, well I can manage to do some of that in nursery' ... And at other times if it's children who have greater need it might be then that we would organize time to sit down and plan jointly. But it just depends who's in the nursery at the time.

In her written text, Hannah described her context and work to collaborate with teachers in the following terms:

The language development service covers a wide area and the teacher has to liaise with many teachers and a few SLTs. Not all these staff may share the enthusiasm for collaborative working...Because of the peripatetic nature of the service, time is always an issue, though the benefits to be gained by

collaborative working are felt to far outweigh the difficulties of setting time aside.

Roz is a nursery teacher in a mainstream school with a base for children with special educational needs including those with language and communication difficulties. She has been working with speech and language therapists in nursery school-based language support provision for about six years. She collaborates with Hannah, who has often worked with the children pre-school in the community clinic. In her written text, Roz spoke of her collaborative work with Hannah:

I have worked with Hannah for many years now and so we have had a long time to build up a positive working relationship. I feel I have a good understanding of the role of the speech and language therapist and I have developed a high professional regard for her abilities.

Asked, in interview, to describe the interprofessional team of teachers and therapists that might work in Glenian nursery, Roz responded: *myself, my speech therapist, the learning support teacher, the parent, who I felt was an integral part of the team, the nursery nurse.* When asked if collaborating is routine in the Glenian nursery Roz replied:

Yes, for sure. Hannah Hall, who I work with mostly you know, apart from the children with special educational needs, she would come up to see me with her

caseload at the beginning of the year. And we get regular feedback from her, you know, reports as to how the children are going. Whether they're having breaks from therapy. Whether they've been discharged... if I have a query about a particular child it's made quite clear I'm able to contact her at any time.

(c) Inverian Primary School Language Unit

The participants in this research from the above provision are Caro, Anna and Orla. Piloting of the semi-structured interview questionnaire was done with a fourth member of the Inverian language unit team, Sara Holm the assistant head teacher in the unit. Sara's audiotaped interview was fully transcribed and excerpts from it are included below. Caro and Orla were invited to participate in this research as they had worked together on a postgraduate 'collaboration' module as two members of a provision trio. Anna, the third member of the trio, job-shares a teacher post within the Inverian language unit with Orla. Orla, as the teacher working on the day agreed to participate in an interview. Both Orla and Anna were present with Caro, the speech and language therapist, at the provision meeting and they both contributed to the empirical material gathered in that context.

Inverian language unit is situated within a large mainstream primary school in Strathian City. The unit classroom is a large cellular classroom set out as an open-plan room shared by all the unit professionals. Sara, who has been working in school-based language support provision for about sixteen years, described Inverian's team: *in the unit there are fifteen children, three teachers, two of them in promoted posts, one*

speech and language therapist, all full time. The promoted postholders are an assistant headteacher and a senior teacher. The SLT is a principal speech and language therapist and the other non-promoted teacher post is a job share held by Orla and Anna.

Caro has worked in the Inverian language unit for three years and before that worked in a variety of school-based language support provision as speech and language therapy special educational needs co-ordinator. Asked how the Inverian language unit team works, Caro responded:

With Orla and Anna particularly, because they job share, they have Wednesdays from about twelve to one fifteen where they pass over what they've done, and discuss what they've done with the children and I always join them with that. So we discuss what the children have done. I know what the teachers have done. They plan their teaching week and their topics and I support. In fact basically I support that. ... With Sara we tend to work rather differently. As we talk a lot we don't actually have a 'we will discuss a child at this point'. ... And I work with Jean [language unit senior teacher] in much the same way. It's on a more sort of ad hoc basis. ... we also have groups that we work together. The phonological awareness group, I work with Sara in that and I work with Jean with that with another group.

Orla has worked in school-based language support provision within the Inverian Primary School language unit for seven and a half years. Asked in interview to describe the Inverian interprofessional team, Orla responded:

Well within the unit there are the three main teaching staff, well one is a job share, nursery nurse, and there's the speech and language therapist.

Asked how the team works, Orla replied:

Well, the activities involve us working in our teaching area and the speech and language therapist also has a teaching area. But that is not. There are no boundaries within those areas.

In her written text, Orla described the unit:

I work in a language unit provision which is part of a mainstream primary school. There are three teachers, a speech and language therapist (SLT) and a nursery nurse. Fifteen children attend the unit on a full time basis and stay in the unit from six weeks to two-and-a-half years, according to their needs, before being re-integrated into their catchment area mainstream school. The children are divided up into appropriate peer groups and each teacher takes direct responsibility for the curriculum, planning and teaching for her group, with all classes working on a shared theme.

These are the seven people who in this research speak of their collaboration relationships and articulate their power relations in these particular three places. In the empirical work for this research, participants told me stories of earlier versions of collaboration in other historical and cultural contexts. I introduce and analyse these in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 6

THE WAY WE WERE: CELLULAR CLASSROOMS, CLINICS AND COLLABORATION

In this chapter I sketch how, as recalled by participants in this research, collaboration was historically, in particular contexts, conceptualized rather differently from present day thinking and practice.

Different historical times have different systems of thought, different ways of conceiving of and responding to issues. Previous historical conditions of teachers and therapists are indicative of particular times' and places' problematization of these professionals' practice. Particular ways of conceiving the issues of practice produced particular solutions. In discussing conceptions of 'collaboration', its conditions of emergence and insertion into professionals' discourses and practices, this section seeks to explore from participants' perspectives their experience of previous conceptions of collaboration realised in particular practices.

In the professional training conditions existing in 1983 for Orla, a teacher, there was no conception of the notion of collaboration:

when I trained there was really no importance on working collaboratively at all with, even what was classed then as your remedial teacher. You were just told this lady or man would come in and take the child away and you had no idea

what that person was doing and even when you were asking 'Oh! You don't need to worry about it' they would say. So you were never trained to even make approaches to these people at all.

In the professional work conditions of that time and context, the notion of 'collaboration' with other practitioners was inconceivable. The only legitimate possibility for practice was that of individual teachers working alone in cellular classrooms. This was the experience too of Roz, a teacher, who trained around 1980. Roz cannot remember any talk at all of collaboration or of the idea of working with other professionals during her teacher training college years.

Caro, a speech and language therapist speaks of the lack of any conception of collaboration during her professional education between 1964 and 67:

I can't remember anything being said or done about education at all. It was far more medical. Far more medical. You would work maybe with OTs and Physios.

Caro talks about the rather different conditions and possibilities for practice in the context of her work as a speech and language therapist in what was then Rhodesia in 1968:

I worked in a rehabilitation unit. And it was. There was an adult side and a children's side and the school part of the children's had mainly... all handicapped children but I worked very closely with the teachers there. So with the teachers and I would have joint groups to help with phonology and to help with language. And I worked with the OT and the Physio. I used to work in the hydrotherapy pool with the physio to get sounds from particular children. I did a lot with the occupational therapist who was very keen on analysis and synthesis of sounds and the organization in dyspraxia and all this sort of thing. So yes it was then. And we worked collaboratively throughout with everything.

In the very different interprofessional conditions of Rhodesia in 1968 collaborations between practitioners were accepted as legitimate practice. In that historical juncture characterized by its own agendas and professional norms constraints or limits, there would seem to have been the possibility of mutually personally and professionally fruitful and satisfying free interprofessional collaborative improvisations.

When Freya trained as a teacher in the sixties there was no talk of collaboration in the college course but in school, collaborative practice was done:

I think it. It was very, very isolated altogether you know.

I can't remember anything about working with other people in college. But I do in my very first school practice. Because of the sort of school I worked in, I did work closely with the nurse and social workers.

You just did it off your own bat really, you know. You just needed to talk. But again it would be done within a classroom situation. And probably after school.

The proximity of these professionals and their joint concern for particular children or groups of children led them, it would seem, to extend their norms of practice, improvising new variations of working which encompassed talking and working closely together in mutually beneficial ways.

Ellen trained as a speech and language therapist between 1989 and 1993. In the Higher Education institution which she attended, doing collaboration was spoken of as a dimension of speech and language therapists' professional practice in schools. Collaboration was no longer taboo, inconceivable or a professional unmentionable:

It was mentioned. Actually I do remember we had somebody come to speak to us one day. It was a teacher, about working in schools and how to try and make it easier. But it wasn't focused on in a big way. I think it was a one-off lecture rather than in a series.

For Ellen, collaboration seems to have been constituted as a 'facilitating' strategy for speech and language therapists who might find themselves working in 'difficult' professional territory in school institutions.

Hannah trained as a speech and language therapist between 1990 and 1994. At that time, in her Higher Education institution, a particular notion of collaboration was conceived of as a relevant discourse and disciplinary knowledge:

There was a small bit, I think, that we did, maybe with Hugh O'Malley. Would that have been right? I think we maybe did a small amount with that and certainly we had to go in and sit in a classroom for a day and have a look at that.

But what I didn't feel there was an awful lot about about joint planning... about collaboration or anything. It was more kind of you know 'The teachers are working on reading and this is where a speech and language therapist may fit into this.' So it wasn't so much about collaboration. But I may have been off that day. And vice versa also. Because you know I was at Merrylee and teaching was there. And I lived with teachers. And I think there was one sort of hour-long lecture that they could go to. But I'm not sure if it was compulsory. So that's what they had in their four years.

I think it was known that if your job was working in in a special school or whatever that you would be working alongside teachers. And I suppose there would have been talk about IEPs and things like that. But it was certainly much more 'That's the teacher's domain'. That sort of thing.

Hannah speaks here of teachers' experience of collaboration discourse also being, in her recollection, limited. Interestingly, she speaks of having 'to go in' to the classroom space which was the teacher's 'domain'. Her talk of reading and where speech and language therapists might 'fit' may be about therapists' professional contribution or 'expertise' concerns or it may have been about identifying general goals for their work. Her recollection that speech and language therapists in special schools were known to work *alongside* teachers is open to different readings. This *alongside* conceptualization may have been realised as joint practice or as parallel practice - or as either/both of these, a kind of co-activity or of co-ordination in particular special school settings at that juncture.

Marvin (cited in McCartney, 1999) discusses different types of collaboration. He characterizes *co-activity* as the lowest level of joint working where 'professionals engage in separate teaching and learning activities, with little sharing of ideas. The analogy is made with children's parallel play' (32). Marvin attributes agreement of general goals to the level and type of collaboration which he characterizes as 'co-operation', 'where general goals are established jointly, but not goals for individual children' (32). If the 'talk about IEPs' was concerned with agreeing targets and

strategies for individual children, this may illustrate what Marvin defines as 'co-ordination', 'a form of group cohesion where the teacher and SLT share opinions and strategies relating to specific students, but do not actually work together' (32).

The experiences of collaboration discussed above are in no way presented as 'authentic or true collaboration by autonomous practitioners or sovereign subjects. They are sketched here as particular, remote processes of the experience of collaboration which were constituted by particular historical and contextual rationalities. In these specific times and places, as recalled by participants, the notion of collaboration was unspoken or described using discourses of 'autonomous professionalism'. That particular juncture's historical layer of thinking and acting in relation to collaboration, what Foucault called its 'discursive formation', privileged a notion of the 'professional' that legitimated practitioners' independence and autonomy. Practitioners whose professional realities and experiences were formed within the legitimate conceptual framework of a particular time and context are unable to conceive of teachers' and therapists' work any differently. Simons (1995), citing Davis (in Rabinow, 1984), reminds us that 'Foucault's historical critique demonstrates that the possibility of thinking differently is contingent on changing conditions' (1995, 88).

In the historical and contextual junctures of a rehabilitation unit in Rhodesia in the nineteen sixties and a school setting that included a nurse and social workers in the nineteen sixties, notions of collaboration were thought of very differently. Conditions in both these times and places include individual practitioners from a variety of

professions working together in a shared space - and the possibilities that such physical proximity offered for shared talk, shared knowledge and information, negotiation of meanings and understandings and agreements concerning practice underpinned by all of these discourses. These old 'order of things', in those historical periods and contexts, are not in this dissertation considered in any way as the 'ideal', 'true' or 'natural' forms of collaboration.

What is interesting about these participants' accounts is what they remember, nostalgia aside, and choose to foreground and story. In Foucauldian terms, their stories speak of historical 'contingencies' (see, for example, Foucault in Rabinow, 1984, 76-90), 'how' rather than 'why' - how things were, how they were and how they came to change.

Speaking of Foucault's position in Rabinow (*ibid.*), Simons (1995) asserts that:

Foucault stresses the tracing of the contingencies that effect new interpretations of concepts, morals and rules. There is no original, true or constant interpretation of a concept...but a series of reinterpretations affirmed by different perspectives ...The way humans interpret the world to render it meaningful depends on their particular and interested perspective (20).

Drawing upon Foucault's analytical tools I am aware that I am refusing to approach collaboration as a unitary concept. Bouchard (1977) reflects that:

all of Foucault's essays follow the same procedure: what was thought to be a unitary concept or what was approached as if it were a concept capable of uniting a wide variety of cases taken from different times is shown, ... to reveal ...the difference of times: ... the disunity of concepts within history (20).

In the next chapter, I present a reflexive account of my early attempts to analyse the empirical material which I had collected from the seven participants. Bringing new conceptual tools and shifted perspectives to bear and 'turning a self-critical eye' (Alvesson and Skoldberg, 2000, vii) on my earlier interpretation, I examine how I attempted to mesh participants' accounts of collaboration with the categories of collaboration that are figured in education and therapy discourses.

CHAPTER 7

A SELF-CRITICAL EYE ON MY PREVIOUS ATTEMPTS AT ANALYSIS

Reflexive aside: my initial attempts to analyse the data were characterized by fears, hesitancies, uncertainties, stumblings and other refusals which resonate strongly with Scheurich's (1997) story of his writing:

I have wavered and mis-stepped; I have gone backward after I have gone forward: I have drifted sideways along a new imaginary, forgetting from where I once thought I had started. I have fabricated personae and unites, and I have sometimes thought I knew something of which I have written. However, caveat emptor, all that follows is never that which it is constructed to appear, an apt description, in my opinion, of all writing (1).

During my initial readings of the data I was tempted into rigid and systematic forms of analysis. I clung to notions of certainty in concerns for research 'objectivity' and the use of objective scientific methods even as my thinking shifted and I no longer thought possible the notion of 'realist', objective knowledge of the social world independent of my assumptions

as the knower. For example, I was aware of my non-participation in detailed interchange with the participants due to my desire not to contaminate the data. At this time I also sensed another refusal concerning the interview data. Kritzman (1988) speaks of Foucault 'rejecting...the indignity of speaking for others' (xviii) in his socio-political causes. In my data gathering, I had been concerned to co-create a space for participants' voices and I became aware at the start of data analysis of my refusal at the prospect of 'speaking for others' that analysis of participants' talk might require. My first attempt to analyse the data therefore focused on the documentary data, which I had gathered in participants' written accounts. Attempting to unravel my thinking and ethical commitments here is complex. I was aware that the participants had produced these 'considered' assignment accounts to be read by me, that I had already read and commented on them, that the participants had read my comments and had agreed that I read them again for the purposes of this research. In this approach to analysis, I then thought that I was not making the initial insertion of my

thinking into their talk, as I would be with the interview data. I had also begun to drift away from my previous thinking that aiming for systematicity and certainty in research thinking and activity would ensure a complete and true account.

My initial attempt to analyse the data was concerned to create a space for participants' voices. Even prior to thinking of notions of language and metaphor constituting participants' thinking on the notion of collaboration, I had sensed that my gathering of their 'spontaneous' talk as they 'collaborated' was a strength in the empirical material that I had collected. I also recognized that collaboration was an important new development in the world of practice of these individuals and that instances of collaboration deserved to be questioned and examined. My first attempt at analysis produced a text which contained large chunks of 'undigested' qualitative data in the form of quotation. Re-reading that text, I was aware that leaving data to 'speak for themselves' was another refusal by me, a refusal of analysis. Perhaps too

it was a clinging to Cartesian notions of using 'objective scientific methods' and of 'presenting objective evidence'. I then risked examining participants' written discourses in terms of the 'safe' legitimated collaboration norms in the policy documentation. I was still seeking to discover some essential commonality; to pinpoint what collaboration is, to discover a single meaning of the word rather than to explore how specific collaborations are thought in the talk and metaphor of these participants. I did not then question the HMI and RCSLT labels warranting the essential ideals of collaboration. I sorted and 'classified' participants' quotations into the normative and narrow HMI (1996) category norms of 'productive collaboration' and RCSLT (1996) 'standards'. I did not explicate how the quotations linked to these 'norms' or normalizing theoretical descriptions and concepts. I did not take the opportunity to extract some important new thinking and learning from the discourses spoken by these practitioners but left the important messages about participants' commitments embedded in the quotations and implicit rather than producing analysis. For

example, I had begun to uncover that these participants offered a more fragmented and pragmatic account of their collaborative relationships rather than the 'truths' of the prescriptive models which are described in the theory. My thinking in the first attempt at analysis was not a privileging of 'voice' or a privileging of speaking over writing; rather, it was a refusal of the performance of research and the production of an analysis through consumption of participants' texts.

What did I do and learn in the second attempt at analysis?

I again sought the 'certainty' of exploring the authoritative 'things said' about collaboration. I did not problematize and critique the 'regime of truth' (Foucault in Cahoone, 2003, 252) of those authoritative principles. Attention was again given to participants' written texts as they spoke or did not speak the discourses of collaboration. I attended to the ways that each individual worded their world (to paraphrase Lather, 1993, 675) but my analysis was still limited to examining what individuals said about the legitimated

ideas about ideal forms of practice. Even as I attended to the discourses, I began to question whether I was still searching for single 'authentic' testimony from each self at the centre of a lived experience as a 'teacher/collaborator' or as a 'therapist/collaborator'. What I thought I had in mind was seeking the ways that language creates specific collaboration relationships' power dominance relations and makes possible and delimits collaborator selves. My selection of participants' accounts from the empirical material again attempted to insert teachers' and therapists' voices into collaboration discourses in circulation. In seeking to do this, perhaps remnants of a view of myself as an 'authority' who could examine, judge, endorse and advocate participants' ideas lingered in my thinking. Perhaps due to the practices of my lecturer-self, I found it difficult to escape the rush to judgement, to question and problematize without privileging and advocating an alternative.

I had begun to think of an analysis which was concerned with effects, what the discourses that the participants speak,

do, in practice, in their particular school-based provision rather than engaging in the essentializing imperative that attempts to pin discourses down to what they are. I sought diversity in collaborations but a trace of my previous seeking after the legitimated norms of collaboration remained. I continued to seek to judge and categorize participants' collaboration practices as 'productive', as characterized by HMI's norms and the RCSLT professional standards' norms of service delivery. I was looking for scientific observation and evidence of what therapist and teacher partnerships did or did not do in their schools in response to the central and essential collaboration discourses about agreements, joint training and evaluation and the RCSLT (1996) and HMI (1996) norms of 'standards' and 'hallmarks'. I was searching for the binary of doing/not doing these central activities and perhaps secretly privileging the 'doing' of them and the 'productive' doing of them as judged by my normalizing 'gaze' (see, for example, Foucault, 1977, 173), my examination and judgement. In questioning how these practitioners engaged in developing collaborative

improvisations, versions of new networked professionalism, I began to let go of the normative. However, in exploring how participants' practices took account of the new standards or norms of collaboration circulating and mutating through the policy documents, I clung to the safe seeking after legitimated 'norms' although I now sought the changing practices rather than reified norms of their joint work. Again in this attempt I did not produce analysis; rather, I leapt to a number of conclusions and made a series of normative statements. In what follows, I introduce some examples illustrating the essentializing discourses which I sought to impose:

These comments might suggest that the two professional groups need to talk at an earlier stage in their professional upbringing. Their comments might suggest that each needs to obtain much better knowledge of their partner's disciplinary knowledge bases' discourses and of the 'expertise' that their partner speaks. For these practitioners, that knowledge can now only be obtained in CPD and in-service opportunities. The comments suggest that the two professional groups' discourses' underlying assumptions perhaps need to be critiqued and struggled over during individual practitioners' professional formation in initial

professional education. Different professional formations that did not institute the binaries of us/them, here/there spoken in participants' comments might obviate the need to later mesh the two professional groups' discourses.

Participants' words suggest ambivalence. Calls for appreciation and valuing of other professionals' inputs are made while personal distance from actual collaboration is maintained. The new policy reality of collaboration is acknowledged alongside an identity constrained and bounded by notions of individual, autonomous professionalism. Comments reveal the novelty of talk about interpersonal and interprofessional collaboration and its processes. This might suggest that talk of collaboration is new, not part of initial professional education or previous CPD experiences. These comments might suggest individual agonistic struggles in instituting discursive realities of mutual trust and respect.

Comment might suggest that teachers and therapists have not opened up the kinds of discursive spaces needed to explore the notion of 'doing collaboration' and its potential benefits and realities. Comment foregrounds the notion that each specific collaboration is only one possible 'collaborative hybrid'. Each specific collaboration relation attends to and struggles over the dimensions and levels of the power relation in collaboration.

Comment would suggest that mutual trust and respect are built, in part, through shared spaces and shared talk concerning all aspects of their work. Sharing a space allows partners to struggle over terms and meanings and to struggle and work day-to-day to mesh their professional disciplinary discourses.

Work to develop the Individualized Educational Programme (IEP) and its associated planning processes are the shared tools that focus and drive teacher/therapist collaborations. Hybrid versions of shared assessment practice, joint IEP planning and target setting (SEED, 1999 and 2000) and joint evaluation using Performance (or Quality) Indicators (SOEID, 1996a and Reid and Farmer, 2001) are now spoken of as dimensions of current practice.

There is talk of a shared focus on the progress of the child users of their service. Participants speak of a coherent approach to planning. They speak of joint target setting and IEP implementation that addresses the holistic needs of the child. There is talk of interpersonal feedback, encouragement and criticism supporting evaluation.

Orla's talk of professional boundaries would suggest that the notion of 'boundaries' continues to mark out practice and delimits possible new variations and hybrid forms of collaborative practice. More hopefully, her talk of consideration of how to 'cross' would suggest that this partnership pair's

changing practice is perhaps at a stage of in-between-ness as they work to dissolve certain of the conceptual boundaries that exist for either/both of them.

The amount of detailed talk privileging the IEP and its processes as the vehicle that drives collaboration perhaps reveals these participants speaking the discourses of the theoretical and conceptual framework of the 'collaborative approach' module which they recently all participated in. The IEP associated activities are of concern to both therapists and teachers and participants from both professional groups relate quite technical aspects of IEP and SMART target setting knowledge in discussion of their particular joint practices. In a variety of ways and forms, new 'academic' knowledge concerning the IEP and its associated processes acts as a shared mechanism to drive collaboration in workplaces and the realities of practice. A technicist concern for IEP and target-setting processes may be privileged in participants' talk but it is perhaps through the meetings, negotiations and discussions required by the IEP and target-setting process that discourses' demarcations, boundaries and binary conceptualizations dissolve.

No one speaks of the purposes of their employing agency. Participants do not talk explicitly of agency level purposes, issues and concerns. There are many references to 'profession' and its related concepts. There is an assumption that the two professional groups provide different inputs to the joint work to support the child. SLT participants speak of different professional roles and of a desire

to enhance knowledge about the other profession by any opportunities that allow talk that constitutes collaboration.

The documentation's conceptualizations of the child with SLI as the shared focus of the work of teachers and therapists are spoken. The field of the interplay of policy and practice within particular provision is mapped. The need for practitioner pairs to spend structured time together on mutual work concerns is spoken of. Shared space and time providing opportunities to share understandings through talk about many aspects of each individual and professional group's work are articulated. The opportunity to discuss documentation discourses and their continuities and the discontinuities that throw-up difficulties for practitioner pairs in their 'operations' of practice is spoken of.

Participants articulate the demands on individuals of the requirement to work within particular policy and legislative frameworks. This perhaps foregrounds the need for health and education agencies to ensure that agency-level policy statements are 'coherent' or well-integrated in their prescriptions and work to support, promote and enable practitioner-level collaborations rather than producing difficulties at individual practitioner level through gaps and discontinuities.

There is talk of distinct professional cultures, being trained to work in different ways and requiring to remember the need to respect each other's training and opinions. This would suggest that there is a need to mesh and perhaps merge the discourses of teachers and therapists at an earlier stage of their professional development, ideally from the start before they 'word their worlds' (to paraphrase Lather, 1993) of practice with different discourses which throw up potential discursive barriers to collaboration. It would also suggest the on-going need for shared talk opportunities to dissolve some of the 'difficulties'. The discursive moves introduced in the HMI (1996) document, notions of a 'user-focused service', a key notion in recent research, and the notion of interprofessional 'respect', are articulated.

Documentation discourses are spoken concerning user child and parents as active and proactive partners whose rights and aspirations should be central in any support team programme planning and SMART target setting decisions (SOEID, 1998). Participants speak of the documentation discourses as 'worthwhile' and desired 'ideally' and alongside, articulate the tensions and difficulties in such a user-child and parent focused approach in practice. There is talk of transgressing the policy documentation's preferred model of working with parents with the professionals acting according to the parents' desires rather than those stated in policy.

Comments might suggest that the professionals' existing discourses of autonomy and expertise have not begun to mesh with the documentation new talk of inclusion of parents and user-children as proactive partners in decision-making. It would seem that further transformations are required to mesh these discourses and dissolve differences in documentation statements and the actualities of practice.

Comments might suggest changed talk about collaboration issues perhaps in keeping with Foucault's (1972) proposition that discourses should be treated as 'practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak' (49). Policy is an expression of practice according to particular discourses. New and changed collaboration discourses have recently been deployed invisibly and powerfully to change therapist/teacher practices. The norms of the new RCSLT and HMI policy discourses and their underlying assumptions and values are struggled over and not normalized or taken-for-granted.

The talk of the participant therapists and teachers would suggest that they are not passive recipients of the discourses constructing their identities and joint activities. It is individual practitioners' resistances which day-to-day govern, permit and delimit joint activities. It is practitioners' lived experiences which continue to be struggled over. Teachers and therapists are, according to this evidence, creating new collaboration hybrids as a consequence of the talk about their interprofessional working in recent policy, research and other

documentation. They have responded with transformations in practice as articulations of collaboration matters have mutated and migrated through the relevant texts. Participants are working out how to act in the new framing of their professional fields characterized by statements concerning joined-up working coming at them from a variety of documentation and CPD events' discussions.

This attempt at analysis sketched in a very limited way some of the power/knowledge relations within the 'collaboration' discourses around which endless agonistic struggles by all 'stakeholders' occur. The acceptance of experts' knowledge and discourses on collaboration in research and published texts has perhaps afforded exclusive rights to speak and act to those 'informed experts' to the detriment of inclusion of practitioners' voices in the debate. There are perhaps interesting and important issues about what counts as 'evidence' of 'effective' collaborative practice. If discourses 'systematically form...objects' (Foucault, 1972, 49), then, where teacher/therapist collaboration is at stake, teachers' and therapists' metaphors articulate their present thinking and their struggle in talk over their collaboration imprisons or shifts their thinking to produce new in-between versions.

Reflexive aside concerning this second attempt at analysis: what did I do here? I produced an empirical report of things written by the three pairs of participants. I essentialized participants' comments on the HMI (1996) recommendations

and RCSLT (1996) standards. I centralized the recommendations and standards themes as the organizing framework for the examination of participants' statements. By doing this, I centralized the recommendations and standards as the 'true', judging, sorting and classifying participants' talk as it corresponded to these 'truths'. I am aware that in doing this, I was enacting a positivistic impulse to logic, coherence and categorization. I sought to produce a bounded, tidy, account, which was founded on the recommendations and standards themes, using the empirical work to 'illustrate' how each theme is spoken of by practitioners. The analysis was at the level of commentary and it was framed and delimited in terms of the recommendations' and standards' 'ideals' of collaboration. This commentary on the binary of acting as recommended by HMI and RCSLT (or not) was perhaps one critique but I was aware that the technique for analysis used here did not provide a means or tool for getting at the effects of collaboration on the individuals involved in it. I am aware that in this attempt at analysis my impulse was to jump to

conclusions concerning implications for practice. The text essentializes the truths of the recommendations and standards and validity of other 'true, objective practices' for example, the rational pursuit of legitimate aims, objectives and systematicity in processes. I desired at this point to attempt a third analysis, an alternative reading of the empirical data collected which was more restless and questioning of the ways in which participants have got their collaborative act together. For example, a sceptical questioning of how participants blandly 'talk the talk' of collaboration while managing to privilege self over Other.

In my third attempt at analysis, my focus was in seeking teachers' and therapists' 'dispositions', what Harrison, Clarke, Edwards and Reeve (2003) speak of as 'the ways in which [individuals]...talk about themselves and their work roles; how they construct and make sense of their own professional identities' (58). Given my focus on individuals' dispositions towards collaboration, their agonistic discursive constructions of their identities and subject positions in relation to the notion of collaboration, I planned to examine participants' deployments of metaphors. In this analysis, I attempted to mobilize the main body of the data, starting to play with participants' deployments of metaphors. I sought instances of individuals, in these specific,

historically contingent, social systems and sites, placing themselves and Others in and out of collaboration relationships. In attempting this kind of analysis, I drew on Foucault's (1998) suggestion that:

discourse can be both an instrument and an effect of power, but also a hindrance, a stumbling-block, a point of resistance and a starting point for an opposing strategy. Discourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it, but also undermines and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it. (101).

Howarth (cited in Harrison et al, 2003) describes this move as:

A more strategic perspective in which discourses are the means for different forces to advance their interests and projects, whilst also providing points of resistance for counter strategies to develop (60).

In the next chapter I introduce arguments for my focus on participants' use of metaphors as a means to explore these individuals' dispositions to collaboration and their discursive constructions of their self-subjectifications and identities in relation to collaboration.

CHAPTER 8

THE EMPIRICAL MATERIAL: STRATEGIES AND SELECTIONS

In my initial attempts at analyses of collaboration discussed above, I took up a realist stance matching up the empirical evidence of collaboration to the 'norms of teacher/therapist collaboration' contained in the statements in HMI (1996) and RCSLT (1996) policy documentation. Subsequently, drawing on some of the 'discursive hardware' (Weber, cited in Harrison, et al, 2003, 69) supplied in the work of Lyotard, Foucault and Derrida, I had begun to question my previous interest in the binary of participants' compliance/non-compliance with the standards and central ideals of collaboration policy.

In the analysis which follows, I shift from those earlier strategies for analysis which took a critical view, albeit limited, of the policy statements while still accepting the 'norms' of those statements. In those analyses, I did not draw upon or attempt to use the intellectual tools of the discursive and language turns provided in the work of Foucault and Derrida. In earlier attempts to 'objectify' collaboration, I was clinging to the 'objectivity and authority' of literal rather than figurative language. I was equating the literal with the factual rather than examining individuals' metaphorical discursive strategies - how they positioned themselves. Nicoll and Edwards (2000) remind us that metaphorical language is also deployed in 'fact' construction and in the production of particular effects:

in the fabrication and reading of texts there are attempts to deploy metaphorical and literal strategies to engender certain effects and meanings as opposed to others. Partly and depending on the reading, this is related to the fabrication of 'facts'. This is not to equate the literal with the factual or the metaphorical with the fictional ... Rather it forces us to consider the textual strategies at play in constructing certain things as facts and others as fictions. (464).

I turned from any attempt to capture, in literal language, the 'reality' or 'essence' of collaboration, a 'hoping to produce an uncontaminated voice' (Wolfreys, 1998, 22). In this analysis I attempted to encounter the referent 'collaboration' through participants' texts and their representations of collaboration in language and metaphor. I sought the ways in which individuals each produced particular discursive constructions of collaboration in the metaphors they deployed and how they positioned themselves in relation to dimensions of knowledge/power in the metaphors they used. I examined how participants use the term 'collaboration', how they strategically deploy specific 'socially and historically located' (Scheurich, 1997, 33) constructions of the complex metaphor 'collaboration'.

In seeking individuals' collaboration related positionalities, their 'ways of knowing...inherently culture-bound and perspectival' (Lather cited in Scheurich, *ibid.* 33), I attended to participants' linguistic tropes, how they use words metaphorically and the figurative language they deployed to constitute collaboration. I read the metaphors in participants' texts as their representations of collaboration. I explored individuals' use

of metaphor in an effort to unpick participants' 'language games' (Lyotard in Usher and Edwards, 1994, 156) to unravel the perspectival versions of collaboration reality that participants introduce. I turned to language and metaphor, assuming, as Lyotard asserts, that "the observable social bond is composed of language 'moves'" (Lyotard cited in Usher and Edwards, *ibid.* 156; original emphasis).

I am aware that I am, in the readings that I attempt here, only able to make some of the coherent and tidy stories which the participants present, unravel. I am attempting to be sceptical (or healthily cynical) about the language participants use to express their story and how they use that language. In using these pieces of texts for a metaphorical analysis I view texts as performances, seeking to explore how participants' language produces a variety of effects and contradicts itself at various levels. Nicoll and Edwards (2000) suggest a 'discursive approach that takes language as performative' (462) and a 'different politics of language ... wherein the literary is taken seriously' (*ibid.* 462). This analysis attempts to take discourse practices and discursive manoeuvres produced in participants' texts seriously, not as an uncovering of 'truths' of practice in relation to 'norms' of policy, but as exercises of power.

How might the matter of collaboration between teachers and therapists be analysed? Here metaphor is used as a strategy of analysis. This collaboration analysis mobilizes metaphor as an analytical tool; collaboration analysis is opened up as a metaphorical space. This borrows from Parker's (1997) view that:

Metaphor opens potentialities of understanding rather than fixing understanding detrimentally and uniquely. A metaphor is permanently an opening for re-reading, re-interpretation (84).

I attend to the metaphors that circulate around and are utilized to figure aspects of 'interprofessional collaboration' in an examination which draws upon Jacques Derrida's understanding of language and metaphor. Derrida, according to Wolfreys (1998), asserts:

· what we need to comprehend about language in general: that all language is more or less metaphorical or quasi-metaphorical (never quite metaphorical and never quite not- or a-metaphorical) (23).

Michel Foucault applies views of metaphor and metaphorical thought in his argument and proposes that analyses of these should be developed:

in terms of the genealogy of relations of force, strategic developments, and tactics. ... one's point of reference should ... be ... to that of war and battle ... relations of power, not relations of meaning (in Rabinow, 1984, 56).

Foucault (in Kritzman, 1988) mobilizes metaphor in his detailed analysis of the Shepherd-God metaphor in Greek and Christian literature. Foucault's analytical approach in that work, linked contradictory themes in ancient texts to metaphors. He

detailed how the development of the 'pastoral technology' (63) of Christian society and culture's thinking and institutions evolved and established 'a series of complex, continuous and paradoxical relationships' (ibid. 63). Foucault's thinking suggested a way to approach the problem of collaboration in the present account. In this research, the teacher/therapist collaboration relationship and its themes or dimensions articulated in participants' deployment of metaphor, were approached as a relation of power

The present analysis deals with collaboration as an issue of power/knowledge. The analysis examines relations between the experience of present day teacher/therapist collaboration, the knowledge used to rationalize collaboration in particular ways and the technology of power wielded to control or 'make' (Foucault, 1977, 170) individual teachers and therapists in school-based language support institutions.

Derrida (1981a), applying an approach analysing the use of metaphors in Lenin's work, suggests of metaphor that:

Taken one by one these metaphors would be insufficient, but in their active 'contradiction' they produce quite another effect. ... this profusion of written figures, ... which mutually set each other off, opens up the practical and theoretical question of a new definition of the relationship (78-79).

Examining the use of metaphor provided a tool to grapple with the relationship between and among the experience, knowledge and power of collaboration in the analysis attempted below.

A number of metaphorizations of collaboration have previously been explored in this work as my conceptual and theoretical framework developed. As the data analysis stage of the dissertation progressed I viewed the participant therapist/teacher collaborative experiences through the lenses provided by many different metaphors. It was perhaps Stronach's (1996) use of a 'weave' metaphor to discuss notions of 'the border' which initially opened up the possibilities of metaphor as an aid to new and alternative conceptualizations of collaboration and as a tool in analysis.

Corbett's (1997) exploration of Stronach's (1996) analysis helped to revise and re-define my conceptualizations through her conception and presentation of inclusive/exclusive boundaries. McConkey's (SEED Conference, 2001) presentation, visually representing barriers to collaboration as a 'blindfolded thrower and catcher mediated by a sighted go-between' metaphor, stimulated further interest in metaphorizing the collaborative variations discussed in individuals' accounts. My analysis attended carefully to the position of Derrida (cited in Wolfreys, 1998) that:

anyone who would believe himself to be making use of metaphors and speaking ...into the *content* or into the ... *tenor* of a vehicle which comprehends the subject, carries him away, displaces him at the very moment when this subject

believes he is designating it, saying it, orientating it, driving it, governing it 'like a pilot in his ship' (103; original emphasis).

Noting Derrida's assertion, I am aware that I am always already in metaphor.

The analysis: selection of texts from the empirical material gathered

I was aware that I had gathered an excessive amount of data, the analysis of which would be beyond the scope of this dissertation. The school-provision meetings' data of collaboration-in-action was the empirical material that I selected for analysis to answer my research question developed at the end of chapter 3a: How do power/knowledge relations function in these individuals' specific collaboration relationships?

I selected the empirical material presented below on the basis that in each of these texts participants perform collaboration discourse, there is collaboration talk in action. On first reading, these selected texts appeared to speak of collaboration content, knowledge or practices that participants are differentially collaborating over. Such matters are of interest in relation to grappling with collaboration and how its 'ideals' fragment or unravel. In addition, these partners' meeting texts, unlike the data gathered in interview and assignment texts, did not appear to present bland talk of individuals and collaborating pairs having got their collaborative act together. The semi-structured interviews' and assignments' data read as a space that produced an entrenching of the 'professional identity' of each individual in the apparent consensus that was spoken and written about.

I further selected for analysis some specific texts from the provision meeting empirical material that I had collected. I selected these specific texts as, in my initial readings of the empirical data, the participants appear in these texts to produce notions of interest and importance regarding their knowledge of collaboration. The empirical material selected for analysis discloses how participants' specific collaboration relations functioned, the forces of the dimensions of power/knowledge that were operating in their work sites, their collaborative space. As suggested by Harrison et al (2003), my attention to agonistic struggles in workplaces follows earlier analyses which view 'the workplace as a site of struggle in which identity or subject positions are discursively constructed' (58).

I was aware that in my chosen empirical data therapists' talk predominated perhaps because I was seeking data concerning school-based 'collaboration' or issues of therapists working in schools with teachers. The therapists were in these meetings in the school space for the purposes of collaboration and it is in their talk as the professional group moving into the school space that on initial readings produced inklings of issues of power/knowledge in collaborating that pressed for further analysis. Analysis of the data produced other possibilities for the predominance of therapists' talk in the provision meetings' data, which are discussed at appropriate points in the analysis below.

The reading that follows attended to the metaphors in the provision meetings' accounts, which reveal the in-between-nesses of collaboration over knowledge and practices. I selected metaphor and my reading of it from among the possible analytical tools which could be brought to bear on the data for a number of reasons. It fitted well with the methodological decision to look for the meaning people attach to their collaborative behaviour, with a focus on talk in the cultural contexts of school-based language support provision and with data gathering which was concerned with participants' discourse about their collaboration behaviour. It also fitted with the conceptual and theoretical framework which underpins this research. How participants figure their collaboration discourse, the metaphors that they deploy in their talk and texts in action was of interest in this analysis. In chapter 9 which follows, I introduce the metaphors that I uncovered and discuss how participants deploy them. Then, in chapter 10, I analyse the metaphors which I signalled in chapter 9. I develop that discussion in relation to some of the dimensions of power.

CHAPTER 9

THE METAPHORS: POSITIONS CONSTRUCTED WITH/IN THE DISCOURSES

As discussed in the chapter on methodological decisions above, discourse is the object of my analysis. I read the provision meeting accounts searching for the metaphors that participants used to construct multiple positions in relation to the discourses of collaboration. As outlined in the same chapter, I was not concerned with seeking 'truths' of the founding subject or the sovereign signifier, rather, I was concerned to view discourse in its 'conditions, its activities and its effects' (Foucault, 1972, 229). I drew on the assertion of Derrida (in Cahoone, 2003) that:

Every concept is necessarily and essentially inscribed in a chain or a system, within which it refers to another and to other concepts, by the systematic play of differences ...difference - is ... the possibility of conceptuality (230).

I was concerned with how the 'things said' constitute the concrete power of the collaboration relation. Attending to the principle of the 'exteriority' (Foucault, 1972, 229) of discourse, I explored the metaphors deployed by participants, the devices that actually construct the collaboration relationship. In so doing, I tried to transgress the kind of thinking that seeks to:

burrow to the hidden core of discourse, to the heart of the thought or meaning manifested in it (ibid. 229)

Here, I seek only to introduce the metaphors and how individual participants deployed them as they construct many subject positions with/in the powerful discourses, some of which I introduced in chapter 4, in these historically contingent meeting contexts.

Nichols (2003) speaks of the aims in assembling these kinds of texts:

This level of analysis does not involve systematic analysis of particular texts but is rather aimed at producing a reading of the overall context within which meanings are constructed and texts are produced (137).

I was aware that the audio recording for this research is implicated in the multiple subject positions which individuals take up in relation to collaboration.

In this chapter and those that follow, I remain aware that my selection, presentation and analysis of the empirical 'data' are processes of my interpretation as the 'knowledge producer'. I sought to remain self-conscious in grasping and understanding the operation of my own thought. I attempted to maintain a questioning, sceptical stance concerning the relationship between the 'knowledge' which I produced and my particular perspectival ways of 'doing knowledge' (Alvesson and Skoldberg, 2000, 5). In seeking the metaphors operating in participants' texts in the empirical data, and in

my analysis below, I tried to remain aware of my own positionalities, my restricted stance and assumptions in relation to this material.

Reading the empirical material, I sought the metaphors deployed by these individuals, the devices that actively construct their specific collaboration relations. Initially, I sought explicit metaphorical or figurative language, for example, spatialization metaphors, notions such as 'fields of knowledge', 'places of practice' and 'professional territories'. Re-reading, attending closely to the language at work here, I began to uncover recurring instances of talk about activities within these individuals' power relationships that resonated with Bishop and Glynn's (1999) suggested dimensions of power relations: 'initiation, benefits, representation, legitimation [and] accountability' (54). Their deployment does not emerge in clear-cut, decided, overtly figurative examples in participants' talk. Rather, these power metaphors are ambivalently and subtly at play in the partners' talk.

I have signalled here that I seek to reveal how metaphors constitute the power relations' functioning in these relationships in relation to the powerful discourses and policy technologies of collaboration. What follows is my introduction of some metaphors and my analysis of how they were deployed by participants as they actively constructed multiple subject positions in relation to the powerful discourses introduced in chapter 4. The conceptual tools which I used in reading the empirical material borrow directly from the sights which Foucault's work provides to view discourse. For example, Foucault (1978) asserts:

That the discoursing subjects are part of the discursive field - they have their place there... The discourse is not the place where pure subjectivity irrupts; it is a space of positions and of differentiated functions for subjects (13).

I drew upon Foucault's notion of governmentality (see, for example, Atkinson, 2003, 9) in examining how individuals' work identities and practices are influenced at a distance by policy discourses' practice specifications and values. Atkinson (citing McCarthy and Dimitriades) asserts that governmentality constitutes how 'power is distributed through 'a decentred system of networks' involving constant self-surveillance' (ibid. 9). Gale (2003) asserts that 'policy technologies' (167) have two purposes:

They overtly influence the manner in which ...development is carried out, teaching styles are chosen...Second...they... influence the thinking, attitude and values, in short, the professional identities and practice style, of all those involved in education (ibid. 167).

Reflexive aside: I read the meetings' texts searching for participants' mobilizations of metaphors. I was aware, as Dexter and La Magdeleine (2002) suggest, 'a metaphor is both reflective of a researcher's worldview and potentially generative of new research directions previously

unconsidered' (362). Borrowing too from Edwards, Nicoll and Tait's (1999) argument for metaphorical readings of the texts of flexibility and globalization, my metaphorical readings of the meetings' texts offered 'a way of countering attempts to inscribe certain meanings' (ibid. 615). I attempted to uncover openings in individuals' discursive moves in relation to the metaphors, which I could open-up to analysis as instances of the multiple and motile subject positions which these individuals took up in relation to the powerful discourses.

In what follows, I explore how teachers' and therapists' worlds of practice have been reconstructed by powerful discursive shifts and related specific policy technologies, and examine how individuals actively work within the assumptions and compelling influences of powerful discourses to construct personally acceptable subject positions and practice identities. Thereafter, in my analysis in chapter 10, I attempt to unravel some of the knots of the dimensions of power which are constituted in participants' metaphors.

The metaphors and how they are deployed in the Benian meeting

In the talk of Freya, the special educational needs teacher, and Ellen, the speech and language therapist, time and grouping (children's and adults' spatialization) metaphors were mobilized. Using the resources of a range of discourses Freya and Ellen tactically took up a multiplicity of transitory identity positions. Freya initiated the metaphors of times and groupings, made them relevant and foregrounded and initiated action on each participant's representation of grouping and timetabling concerns. The 'time' metaphor proliferated in the discussion that followed. Ellen and Freya spoke of time as a real, valuable and limited resource. Its use was represented as a scarce commodity to be 'given', 'haggled over', directed and agreed in detail and in full. Questioning or challenging the norms of timetabling practice was not possible within education discourses and school culture (see, for example, Foucault, 1977, 149-151). Both Ellen and Freya actively worked within the powerful timetable discourses to construct acceptable practices and identities.

Freya transgressed previous norms of school grouping practice by speaking of her timetable thinking and proposed timetable decisions to Ellen. Although, at this point, it was Freya's education identity and knowledge of timetable practice that counted. Freya positioned herself as the timetable 'expert', appropriating the right to insert her representation of the groups' times and constitution:

F So, my group, Ellen, will be in the morning of Monday. ...That will be a group.
 And group two is going to be.

- E That's Margo.
- F With Margo will be Willie, Julie, Sarah, and Grant
- E Okay.
- F and she would have them every morning. So she would actually be. She would actually have all that and Sarah and I am on Tuesday morning.
- E So they would be available then?
- F Then if you wanted to catch up. Tuesday. Right.
- E Although that's just to the end of term.
- F Yes.
- E So we could work on that one.
- F Work on that one. So it would give you a chance to see them

Freya built her position that *she would have them every morning* as 'the norm', a neutral and reasonable fact. Given the context of their particular discourse and practice, Ellen, drawing on her local knowledge, immediately understood the implications of Freya's preferences and representation of the times and groupings *that's Margo ...Okay*. Ellen did not lack knowledge, but, as a therapist, her knowledge and experience was not sought, valued or given equivalence in this 'school' activity. Her discourses were, at this point, not legitimated. She was not empowered to initiate here, to define what constituted appropriate knowledge and practice, although, as therapist, she was a stakeholder with equal interests in the outcome produced by this timetabling exchange within the school institution and education system practice of timetabling.

Ellen then subverted Freya's identity position as specialist. Ellen inserted her voice into the norms of education timetabling discourse in ways that disrupted Freya's previous self-positionings. Ellen transgressed the non-legitimation of her experience within an education practice that excluded as Other, non-education, voices. Ellen voiced knowledge of the language unit setting, having, from her perspective, read Freya's previous statement foregrounding Margo's group and time allocation. Ellen introduced a question, in relation to what had been excluded, not been said, by Freya *so they would be available then? ... Although that's just to the end of term ... So we could work on that one*. Ellen strategically positioned herself to ensure that her views and interests were taken into account. Ellen worked with and within the discourses of school term timetabling practices in her own interests and those, from her perspective, of the children.

Ellen's move that *they would be available* inserted an opening for her to work with some of the children allocated by Freya to that group. Ellen positioned herself as accountable to Freya concerning work in school and in the same manoeuvre identified with the policy discourses of practitioners' co-accountability to the children. This allowed her to legitimate her 'professional' aspirations, to 'do therapy' with the children.

Ellen contested Freya's preferred grouping allocation and made an alternative 'grouping' move:

E Ella and I were speaking about it yesterday - Ella the assistant speech therapist,
and wondering about maybe possibly splitting the group into two little groups.

Ellen re-configured Freya's previous timing and spatialization of the children. Ellen inserted her professional interests and perspective on the benefits to the children. In the same move, she positioned herself as accountable to Freya for legitimisation of her suggestion within the school setting:

E Just for the SALT bit.

F For the SALT bit. Yes.

E But I don't know how practical that would be.

F Yes

E Whether. We were sort of discussing well maybe we could have one in a. One group that was slightly higher level and one group that was slightly lower level

F Mhm

E out of that seven

F Mhm

E that you mentioned

Ellen's move tactically reified the 'groupings'. The groupings could be split, categorized as higher or lower and swapped over according to how Ellen chose to represent their properties to Freya to gain her legitimation for that particular grouping configuration:

E and then we'd swap over. So.

F Yes.

E The week after or whatever.

F Yes, well, if we think Amber and Brian might make a nice little group.

E Mhm.

F I think.

E It's just it's sometimes difficult to. You know something at a level

F Yes

E that's appropriate without.

F Yes.

E So that it's not too high for the poor ones.

F Mhm.

E And they don't sit there getting bored.

E Exactly the same theme and everything

F Yes

E just slightly. And the advantage would be that it'd be slightly more sort of aimed at the right level for the little ones maybe.

F Yes that's good.

E And they wouldn't have to wait so long for their turn. They'd get more chances.

F Yes.

E Wouldn't they, to have a go?

F Yes that's true. That's true.

Ellen foregrounded the notion of 'level' as her assumed grouping criterion. Ellen established Freya as the education institution grouping 'expert', the legitimate authority to whom Ellen deferred on grouping needs and decisions. Deploying the binary oppositions of high and poor (and the suppressed terms of 'low' and 'able'), Ellen's appeal for 'ability grouping' tactically inserted a prevailing education norm of practice. Ellen tactically exploited current pedagogical 'truths' of grouping practices. Ellen's discursive appropriation of an education discourse which benefited her own and her view of the children's interests was a compelling strategy to deploy in questioning the assumptions and preferred representations of Freya, the teacher. Ellen's deployments of 'ability level' binaries borrowed from education discourses transgressed prevailing discourses and social and professional practices within her own professional group concerning, for example, 'a duty of care' to an individual client.

Ellen tactically deployed a number of 'learning' manoeuvres, which operated to unquestionably link children's learning to their placement in the 'ideal', 'optimum' group. Her discursive strategy was to wrap up her view of the children's learning needs in a series of practical concerns' moves. Ellen's use of these education discourses tactically warranted her resistance to Freya's previous grouping prescription. Ellen, identifying with and appropriating education's 'ability' discourse, benefited from the power of that ideology as a legitimate norm about which to speak freely in the ritual of school 'grouping' discourse.

Identifying with the children's learning worked to Ellen's benefit, strengthening her argument's legitimacy. Ellen deployed both the 'pragmatic' discourses of teaching and the authoritative social-science discourses of education. Her tactic was to represent her grouping suggestion as a 'rational' and a 'natural' unproblematic solution for all of the 'logical' reasons she marshalled in support. Ellen, here, was located in the movements of discourses. She perhaps transgressed her previous professional thinking and adopted and deployed the discourses and metaphors of education as a strategy of benefit in the overall process of obtaining Freya's agreement. Ellen had taken up the discourses and representations of education and sought Freya's compliance with those orthodoxies.

Ellen actively constructed equivalencies and sameness in the work of the two professional groups, perhaps in a search for synthesis in practitioners' work or for equivalence in practitioners' contribution to collaboration:

E And there's in speech therapy. You know the therapy outcome measures thing.

F Yes.

E That we've got to do where you have aims that you are working towards?

F Right.

E That are tied up with the IEP really? We're doing about two word level understanding.

F Actually two word level.

E But he's pretty much got it now.

F Oh.

Ellen took up a discursive position identifying with the *outcome measures* 'norms' of speech therapy planning. Tying *outcome measures* and *the IEP*, Ellen strategically identified with the education collaboration policy discourses of joint goal setting and of using the IEP as the vehicle to harness the contributions of all. In the move *that we've got to do* she deployed the discourses of 'essential' professional requirements. Ellen accepted that external controls exercised by an authority to which she and other SLTs were accountable governed these aspects of her work in school. These practices, with the legitimization device of *got to do*, were represented as reassuringly normal and taken-for-granted. Ellen constructed herself as accountable to speech therapy standards and practices and constructed Freya as the equivalent in relation to special education practices. Ellen worked the tactical move of denying either individual any choice or agency concerning their compliance with these standards and practices. She identified herself and positioned Freya as essentially, unquestionably, accountable for compliance with their 'own' agency's controls through specific practices and standards. In the same move, Ellen's *got to do* signalled her understanding and perhaps contestation of the dominance and reductionism of the 'professional' discourses of standards and compliance. Ellen actively balanced these SLT requirements with the teacher's 'equivalents' *where you have aims that you are working towards?* Ellen articulated her uncertainties about prevailing school planning practices discourses while she simultaneously took up a position of being willing to work with education discourses.

Ellen sought Freya's agreement to her position of equating their practices and acceptance without contestation of the norm of doing the *outcome measures thing*. Ellen transgressively identified herself with education discourses, speaking of *aims*, *working towards* and *the IEP*. She collaborated with Freya in ways that risked discussion of these school-site practices. Ellen's construction actively minimised difference and represented parity and mutuality in goals. She did not foreground her 'professional expertise' or try to exclude Freya's professional group's knowledges. However, wrapped up her manoeuvre, *doing two word level understanding*, Ellen did tactically identify with the discourses of specialised linguistic assessment knowledge.

Ellen identified with the planning 'ideals' of her professional group, foregrounded for Freya the alternative discourse of education planning and linked these two specific practices in a perhaps reductive search for synthesis, equivalence and sameness. Ellen's enunciations were legitimate within this school institution's discursive formations. She manoeuvred with and within the powerful discourses' governance that co-practitioners create a supportive and productive work relationship. She tactically tried to deploy the language of SLT policy on 'practice requirements' and of the 'equivalent' education discourses' policy technologies. She actively constructed the kinds of equivalencies in the planning practice of teachers and therapists which were constructed in powerful collaboration policy discourses, for example, the notion of IEPs as the vehicles that 'harness all material and human resources' (SEED, 2000, 6). Ellen had transgressed her earlier professional identifications and imposed upon herself the identity of collaborator. This more recent self-identification oscillated and was entangled with

another view of her 'expert' SLT self, a subject position that wove through her discourses. Ellen's moves sought to produce, perhaps partly for the research audiotape, the collaborators' positions of harmonious mutual engagement in equivalent tasks around specific 'essential' planning processes.

In a move introducing the IEP, Ellen identified herself with providing 'input' and a desire to 'keep up-to-date':

E You know I've got a thought about these IEPs.

F Yes.

E Could you maybe make sure that we would get a copy of it?

F Yes.

E Well I don't know what's happened while I'm away but previously we were having a bit of input into it.

F Yes, yes.

E But I know Ella, the assistant, one time I got her to copy all the IEPs for everybody.

F Yes.

E So that I had an up-to-date one. But that was over a year ago.

F Right.

E So.

F Well we can. Well we need.

E Just to sort of try and keep up-to-date.

- F Yes well as soon as we get back to school on the first day of term we'll if its.
- E That might be a good day to do it.
- F We can do it that first night.
- E Yes on the first in-service day.
- F Yes.

Ellen positioned herself as a collaborator, disposed to *keep up-to-date* with IEP planning. She had imposed the school's co-ordinated planning practices upon herself. She identified with the notion in education discourses of the IEP as the 'contact zone', the vehicle or tool for collaboration. In seeking school institution documentation, the shared paperwork ritual, she accepted the doing of a specific collaboration policy technology. Ellen identified with the collaboration policy discourses' constructions of the benefits to the users of their joint service of practitioners sharing education IEP 'paperwork'. Ellen's promotion of the school copying the IEPs to SLT assumed a position of agreement making and co-ordination, which transgressed their previous ways of working. In the same move, Ellen, perhaps speaking from a position of professional autonomy, initiated and represented her view of 'better' collaboration practice to Freya. The identity positions which she took up in relation to the specific, historically contingent, site and circumstances of their collaboration were transitory, oscillating and uncertain. Did the effects of this dominance-power relation work to keep professional autonomy intact? Ellen's oscillations suggest that she was struggling to detach from earlier versions of her professional self. She actively constructed and

reconstructed personally acceptable positions within their specific collaboration relation and in relation to her performance of collaboration for the research.

Freya could not contest the benefits of Ellen's proposed new ritual of 'shared paperwork'. For Freya to have challenged Ellen's promotion of IEP sharing would have been to take up a position excluding herself from the authoritative assumptions of collaboration relationships constructed in the discourses, thereby having positioned herself as unreasonable, non-collaborative, and non-supportive of partnership and of the progress of the children. Ellen's strategic manoeuvres shifted power to her and produced talk of planned action by Freya in response *yes well as soon as we get back to school on the first day of term we'll if it's... We can do it that first night*. Freya identified with the priority of doing it. She articulated when it would be done in a series of moves, *as soon as, the first day, that first night*. Freya voluntarily ceded power to Ellen and, in the same move, drew Ellen within the distance control effects of collaboration policies' technologies. Freya did not contest the assumed benefits of good communication and shared paperwork discourse/practice within the multiple policy discourses and the policy techniques that had reconstructed collaboration. Freya was disposed not to resist Ellen's self-identification with education's IEP discourses.

The metaphors and how they are deployed in the Glenian meeting

Hannah and Roz spoke about the features of a school-based service-level agreement exemplification. They exploited a number of discourses to construct positions in relation to the 'policy technology' (Ball, cited in Gale, 2003, 166) of 'agreements'. The

metaphor of 'training' was mobilized in different ways by both Hannah and Roz and each took up multiple and, at times, ambivalent positions in relation to it. A second metaphor of 'the set up' was introduced by Hannah and thereafter, worked by her to construct and reconstruct subject positions in relation to the health/education interface in the specific contingencies of this school site.

Hannah introduced the metaphor of 'training':

H The first one was about undertaking in-service training with the teaching staff to outline our role. Explaining how the service would operate. I think that's a useful thing to do but there's a limit to how many times that you would have to do that.

R Yes I think you've done that with Glenian once before haven't you?

H Mmm. Yes a long while ago.

Having introduced the training metaphor, *explaining how the service would operate. I think that's a useful thing to do*. Hannah then inserted the notion of time as a delimiting valuable resource, *but there's a limit to how many times you would have to do that*. Hannah's position in relation to doing training was ambivalent. Her self-constructions oscillated - she articulated the 'useful' nature of training, exploited the discursive resources of the powerful policy discourses' specifications of 'joint training' and of offering training to partners and, ambivalently in the same moves resisted and contested doing training. In viewing time as a shortage commodity, a limited, finite

resource that must be carefully rationed and used, Hannah seemed to accept current powerful social discourses' norms of utility and 'economic productivity' and perhaps, a reductive view of the education policy discourses of 'productive collaboration'.

Hannah's collusion with the governmentalities of 'time and motion' and 'economic efficiency - returns on time invested' discourses' norms of practice delimited her 'doing training' in school.

Hannah, contesting the compelling policy discourses of training, introduced another counter-discourse. She seemed to identify with the position of doing training very occasionally at irregular intervals:

H And while it would be useful to do now and again on a you know with a big sort of gap between them so that the people aren't having to sit and listen.

R To the same.

H To the same thing again. Yes. Over and over again.

Calling to question the 'amount' of training was another strategic move deployed by Hannah to counter the policies' constructions of training:

H I think that would be quite a useful thing to do. Bit of course if it's. You know this is talking about our new Autism unit.

R Yes.

H Which has probably got a smallish amount of staff. We're talking about a staff of I don't know. How many?

R Well say four to for the sake of it.

H Yes well. So that's you know quite a big bit of training and also with a wide range of things to talk about if you were talking from nursery

R Yes indeed.

H up until primary seven.

In this manoeuvre, Hannah contested the notion that she train the school practitioners on the grounds that the 'amount' of training required would be impossible to do.

Hannah mobilized 'the set-up' metaphor. Perhaps by identifying with a position reifying the current contingencies and practices, she sought to justify her limitation of training:

H So yes in theory

R Yes.

H that would be a good thing to do but because of the way that our I keep saying provision but just because of the way that the set-up works

R Yes.

H with community and mainstream schools

R Yes, yes mainstream.

H things are a wee bit different.

Hannah's manoeuvre reifying 'the set up', its norms, essential working and permanent unalterable nature functioned to prohibit critique of that prevailing set up as a product of human decisions about social systems and structures. Her *just because of the way that the set-up works* move operated to exclude discourses which re-thought and restructured the set-up's practices in new ways. She deployed discursive resources which inserted 'the reality' of agency-level boundaries, demarcations and barriers. Hannah seemed to identify comfortably with these discourses' norms; they had imposed their 'regime of truth' (Foucault cited in Rabinow, 1984, 74) on Hannah and been accepted by her, used as resources to frame her discourses/practices and identities. Hannah resisted being forced to comply with the powerful discourses that constituted doing training as a norm of joint working practice and which sought to establish a position of teachers' and therapists' acceptance of and accountability to that norm. Hannah did not unambiguously identify with a position of compliance with the recent education policy discourses' norms that teachers and therapists undertake joint and shared training. She took up an ambivalent subject position which contested the values, purposes and constructions of 'good practice' norms manifested in the new teacher/therapist collaboration policy discourses.

What was at stake in Roz and Hannah's exchange was the timing and spatialization of the 'reasonable' training of the teachers as regulated and legitimated by Hannah, the speech and language therapist. Hannah established her view of the training possibilities according to her therapist subject position and to her benefit. Training, for Hannah, at this moment, was something that she would do to or for teachers. Hannah deployed

recurring quantification manoeuvres which functioned to build up her position that the quantity of training made her doing any training unreasonable and impossible. Hannah identified with the 'natural impossibility' of her contributing to training. In her deployment of 'reasonable' social-discourse manoeuvres in her 'explanation-justification' moves, Hannah also seemed to seek Roz's legitimizing agreement and collusion with her identity position that discounted any training.

Roz, perhaps understood what Hannah was not saying about how she felt about the changed work conditions which accepting the position of 'doing training' would produce. She attempted to re-work Hannah's position in relation to training in terms of perhaps less threatening 'normal' education institution co-working practices:

R On the other hand if you were able to come and see the children as it suggests. In the classroom setting or at the meetings then you could probably get across some of the points necessary about your role.

Ignoring what was going on in the positions taken up by Hannah justifying her non-involvement in training, Roz used the moves *come in, see... the children* and *at ...meetings*, identifying with these as 'useful', reasonable practices. Roz's move *come and see* troubled and challenged Hannah's position. Hannah's tactics sought to legitimate limits. Roz's position was to actively work to recast Hannah's position seeking possible openings for Hannah to transgress her self-enunciated delimited position to reconstruct more personally acceptable practices with which she might

comfortably comply. Seeking to undermine and subvert Hannah's previous identifications, Roz transitorily identified with the position that education policy discourses of 'agreements' constituted 'normal', 'reasonable', do-able practices. Roz exploited the 'agreements' discourses' resources to manoeuvre to the benefit in her view of the children, herself and perhaps also, Hannah. Roz sought Hannah's consent to the practice of coming in, her self-monitoring of her practice identities in ways that colluded with the agreements discourses' 'regime of truth' (Foucault cited in Rabinow, 1984, 74).

Roz's manoeuvres re-working the 'training' metaphor sought to constitute *coming in* as of benefit to Hannah. Roz's construction voluntarily ceded power to Hannah, identified by Roz as 'language expert' - with legitimate rights and responsibilities to disseminate her specialist knowledge. Roz identified with the view that such practices were legitimate for Hannah and professionally benefited teachers in the school. Roz sought to subvert Hannah's previous self-imposed exclusion from 'in school' work, perhaps viewing that practice as a strategy of avoidance of accountability within the school. Roz introduced discourses/practices that would operate to bring Hannah in. Roz identified with the position that in school a space for Hannah's voice acceptable to Hannah could be opened up. Roz's moves also worked to draw Hannah into a position of working in school, a position in conformity with the practice expectations in collaboration policies.

Hannah deployed in combination 'the fact' and 'work for' manoeuvres to legitimate the prevailing spatial arrangement and current practice, how she chose to do things 'in' and 'out' of the school space:

H And because of the fact that I work for health and not for education I don't tend to come and work in the classroom setting an awful lot.

R No, that's true.

Hannah introduced her central identity position, which actively exploited the 'contractual' discourses to resist and contest the values of the collaboration discourses and to free herself from any position of compliance with standards of co-operation between SLT Service and education. Her introduction of 'the fact' manoeuvre sought to function as a compelling tactic to exclude any alternatives to her self-placement out of school. Hannah's 'fact' move, the central term in the binary opposite fact/fiction, operated to exclude any challenge to her 'factual' representation as 'fiction' and invalid. Hannah's representation of the essential 'fact' of her health employment, reasonably legitimated her spatial positioning. Her out-of-school self-spatialization was represented unproblematically as a matter of simple arrangements, the neutral result of 'the fact' that she was a health, and not education, employee. She sought to avoid any identifications or implications in discourses, and practices which would reconstruct her 'material conditions' (Colley, 2003, 86) of work.

Hannah's move inserting her central reifying and reductive self-identification as 'health employee', sought to make her essentially accountable solely to the authority of that agency's norms and standards of practice. Taking up a position of consenting only to the professional governmentalities of health seemed to be central in Hannah's identity, a subject position which resisted any identifications with new discursive resources which sought to differently govern collaborative practice:

H It's different for therapists that are paid by education that do come into school and I think you know you've said that works quite quite nicely.

R Well, I have had to work with, not yourself, but a different therapist with different children who have actually got special needs as opposed to the mainstream children that we've been talking about

H Uh-huh.

R up till now. And there was one. One who purely withdrew the children for therapy and another one who withdrew one session and worked in the classroom for the second session.

H Mhm.

R And I think it helps both the child and the teacher to understand better

H Uh-huh.

R if the therapists are actually in the classroom occasionally at least.

H Yes, yep. So yeah, I think it does work quite well but we're restricted

R Mhm.

H by who pays your salary

R Yes, yes.

H basically.

Hannah's account privileged the prevailing spatial arrangement of clinic base for her work which functioned to distance her from the school and its practices, culture and politics. Hannah's moves positioned any challenge to her assumptions as illegitimate and lacking in knowledge of SLT agency 'rules'. That 'the fact' of health employee practices in clinics and schools was a human creation, the product of particular systems' assumptions and ways of thinking about that practice remained unspoken. Hannah's manoeuvres functioned to resist any potential for innovations in practice. Identifying with change in the prevailing systems and structures seemed to be taboo, unspoken in Hannah's discourses and identity positions.

Hannah constructed and reconstructed her position as outwith all school values and relations. From her perspective, she was only infrequently and tangentially implicated in education's discursive practices and apparatuses. Hannah's manoeuvres sought to disallow any calling into question of that 'fact' or any production of alternative representations and to exclude any challenge to prevailing practice. Hannah's discursive positioning and re-positionings centralized and manoeuvred to legitimate the norm that she worked outwith school. Hannah identified comfortably with her normal prevailing work spatialization. She exploited the governance of the contractual limits' discourses in her moves to securely construct her out of school clinician identity position.

Hannah spoke of the other SLTs *coming into* school. In the move *works quite nicely*, she endorsed and legitimated, *coming in* as a practice which *works*. She then used the manoeuvre *paid by education* to legitimate, in their different accountability, the coming into school practices of these others. Hannah identified with the notion that the 'central reality' of the 'contract of employment' constituted 'real' constraints and limits for practice. Hannah took the position that 'the payer' produced non-transgressable limits on practice. She exploited discourses of compliance with employer control, tying these to discourses contesting change or innovation in relation to collaboration. She identified with a position that sought no-change to prevailing practice. In her moves Hannah sought to avoid voluntarily ceding any power in relation to the legitimacy of her 'out' positionality.

Roz opened a space to de-naturalize and trouble the identifications constructed by Hannah. Roz made Hannah's prevailing spatial practice problematic in a series of discursive moves:

R Well, I have had to work with, not yourself, but a different therapist ... there was one. One who purely withdrew the children for therapy and another one who withdrew one session and worked in the classroom for the second session.

H Mhm.

R And I think it helps both the child and the teacher to understand better

H Uh-huh.

R if the therapists are actually in the classroom occasionally at least.

Roz identified with the assumption of the benefits of 'in-class' work by SLTs, in-class work *help[ing] both the child and the teacher to understand better*. That working together in-class helps, was the powerful education collaboration policy discourses' position, which Roz identified with and to which she made herself accountable. Given prevailing education discourses of locational inclusion, contesting that view was made professionally risky. Roz introduced the matter of individual SLT's different practices governing their work with children in this particular school-site - in/out/withdrawal. She contrasted in and out spatializations and represented 'out' as the illegitimate, problematic position and 'in' as of benefit or *help*. Roz identified with the position, that 'in class' work helps understanding - a compelling discursive resource to appropriate and deploy in the education arena. Roz's manoeuvres functioned to disallow any challenge by Hannah, as to challenge the prevailing education norm that in class support work was beneficial would have been for Hannah to identify with a position non-supportive of children and teachers. Hannah chose to say nothing about the contradiction that SLTs coming in *works quite nicely* and *quite well* but that she rarely did it. Hannah's *paid by* counter-discourse sought to reify and justify prevailing established spatial restrictions or limits. Her position which constituted current norms of practice as 'real' and immutable sought to put them beyond question or transgression. Hannah did not voluntarily cede power to change her prevailing out of school working practice and identity.

Hannah's deployments in her series of we/you manoeuvres constituted her acceptable in-school identities, the ways of thinking and acting within school with which she personally and professionally chose to associate herself:

H Because I think we we've got to know even when it comes down to things like say you you're looking at you've got to know what's happen happening in the school and in the nursery so that you can make sure your therapy is appropriate.

R Uh-huh.

H really the important thing is this thing that they're having trouble with on a day to day basis So it's got to. You know we we've got to know exactly what's going on so that we can support as well.

R Right.

H So we can let you know where you know we can talk about where we perceive the difficulties to be. How you can help with those areas and also can pass back to us what is difficult in the nursery and then we can maybe think about

R Mhm.

H help.

What was at stake here for Hannah was the discursive constitution of some notion of 'collaboration', of reciprocity and equivalencies in the amount, balance and direction of assistance. Hannah's manoeuvres functioned to give nothing away of her prevailing identifications with the norms of independence and autonomy. Hannah's position was

to assert the balance of assistance and remain silent about any lack of reciprocity. Each assisting the other was a prevailing norm in school-based collaboration discourses. For Hannah to have challenged the norms of collaboration would have been self-marginalizing and not in her interest. Hannah's moves gave little away personally or professionally. Her moves offering her specialist 'expertise', external appraisal of difficulties and recommendations for 'solutions' collided with Roz's aspiration that she 'come in'. Hannah's identity seemed to be trapped, ossified in versions of 'SLT adviser'; she resisted the construction of co-equal positions, for example, resisted identifying with the 'joint problem solving' practice positions recommended in the teacher/therapist collaboration discourses.

Hannah acknowledged some of the powerful education curriculum discourses when she spoke of the practices that teachers could beneficially speak of to therapists:

H But I also think that it would be really useful for us if we could have teachers coming and speaking to us about things like. You know, you know basic things like you know the format that you use for teaching children to read.

R Right.

H Or various reading schemes. Why you choose this one. Why you choose that one. And you know the concepts that you'd be looking at in primary one for a child to be you know to be able to understand. But we would like to know more about that.

R Right.

H And.

R The basic understanding of five to fourteen?

H Yes, well uh-huh that sort of thing. We've done. We, we've all got an a kind of an idea of five to fourteen. But maybe it's not really so much the five to fourteen. Well it's the kind of bare bones of it. How do you do this? And how do you work your way through this? And that would be really really useful to kind of help us understand what you actually expect of children at different ages because we know what we expect of them as far as their speech and language is concerned

R Uh-huh.

H and their social skills. But we're maybe not quite so sure what's expected of them educationally. And that that would be really useful

R Mhm.

H information to have.

Hannah knew of the school '5-14 curriculum framework' discourses. She acknowledged that improving her knowledge and understanding of 'actual expectations' would be 'useful'. However, her position was that of self-estrangement from the governance of the powerful 'learning expectations' and 'appropriate curricular experiences and activities' discourses. Hannah identified most comfortably with the separate work spatializations of teachers and therapists.

Hannah spoke of the knowledge that teachers had the legitimate right to speak of to therapists. She identified with a view of SLTs as professionally intact knowers of the authoritative discourses of the development of children's *speech and language* and *social skills*. Hannah excluded teachers' knowledges of these matters. Her moves worked to maintain current positions, the prevailing power balance, not ceding power on the matter of SLT knowledge bases. In Hannah's move *not quite so sure what's expected of them educationally*, she identified herself with a lack of educational knowledge. That move ceded power to teachers as knowers of educational matters and simultaneously distanced Hannah from those discourses' controls. She perhaps identified with a new practice of SLTs ceding power to teachers to introduce education matters to SLTs. Hannah may have been aspiring to acquire, accept and operate within an educational knowledge base or, deploying *not quite so sure...educationally*, she may have sought to maintain the prevailing knowledge/power balance constituting educational matters as outwith her knowledges and previous practice experience and irrelevant to her professional self identity positions.

Speaking of the advantages of school-based service level agreements, Hannah introduced her 'higher up' series of manoeuvres:

H I think if it comes from higher up then it is seen as being important

R Mm.

H by everybody. And it's not just then 'Oh that that wee lassie that comes in to to speak to you about the speech problems'. You know, or whatever. And I think.

You know, I think sometimes that can be the case and people do choose or choose not to use the resource. But if it comes from higher up then it's expected.

Hannah introduced the, for her, central discursive norms of 'hierarchy'. She accepted and identified with the norms of hierarchical organization and of the devolution of power from 'higher powers'. She identified with the position that individuals' practices were constrained by, and dependent for legitimization on, the power of *higher up*.

Hannah knew of the new policy discourses of school-based service-level agreements and of the ways in which they might work to re-shape SLT practice in schools. She spoke of 'agreements' carrying the legitimatizing authority of *higher up* into the school. Hannah linked *higher up* and *seen as being important by everybody*. Hannah seemed to identify with the notion of power as hierarchical, imposed from above. She took the position that the permission of higher powers would transform collaboration into a relation seen as *being important*, legitimate and desired as of benefit, by *everybody* in the school. Hannah aligned herself with the view that collaboration practices were possible and permissible only subsequent to their legitimisation by *higher-up*. Hannah's manoeuvres functioned to constitute collaboration knowledge and practices as legitimate - only after their authorization by *higher-up*.

While Hannah spoke of an agreement by *higher up* producing the direct, instrumental and beneficial effect of legitimating her presence in school, her identification with prevailing relations worked another move. The prevailing lack of the essential

legitimization by higher powers functioned to justify her position - the norms of her out-of-school self-spatialization and limited in-school collaborations. Hannah's *then it's expected* move inserted her agenda of the directly legitimizing effects of collaboration's authorization by *higher up*. The *then its expected* move maintained the prevailing practices and balance of power and her preferred identity until *then*. Hannah's position was to resist the influences of the new discourses and their standards and accountability technologies. Rather than outright refusal of these discourses she struggled agonistically with them. She channelled what seemed to be her fear and discomfort concerning them into a 'deferral' of engagement with them, 'justified' by her position that any change needed the authorisation of *higher up*.

The metaphors and how they are deployed in the Inverian meeting

In the Inverian meeting, participants mobilized the metaphor of the 'plan'. Orla mobilized the plan metaphor as a verb, a doing word, 'to plan', a joint activity, but, thereafter, the participants discursively positioned themselves in relation to aspects of the plan (noun). Doing or making plans for Amy, Chelsea and Steffi, uncovered areas of their co-practice to which each of them brought different specialist, disciplinary knowledges, professional practice 'expertise' and discursive resources. Caro the speech and language therapist and Orla and Anna the job share teachers constructed multiple subject positions in their discursive moves in relation to 'sorting out' a plan for each of three children to move from their current placement in the language unit back to their local neighbourhood schools.

To plan integration was the norm in the language unit site. The practice of planning for integration was not open to question, it was accepted by these three individuals as a norm of their school-site 'co-operative practice'. The discourses which governed the thinking and practice of the Inverian practitioners were those of integration and not, for example, of inclusion. Their discourses/practices remained governed by the integration discourses' notions of normalization and assimilation of the child rather than by the discourses of inclusion that would have questioned and sought to change school systems and structures, including those relating to collaborative practice.

How each individual worked the 'plan' metaphor was telling in this site. Caro, for example, seemed to view linguistic assessment as her responsibility, her specific 'SLT contribution' to planning. From the introduction of the 'plan' metaphor, the language unit practitioners made multiple moves in relation to 'the assessment' of Amy, Chelsea and Steffi and 'the programme' of activities which they should experience. Orla, Anna and Caro worked within the powerful health and education agencies' 'planning' discourses of assessment and planned programmes to construct acceptable identifications and practices.

Orla introduced the 'plan' metaphor and tied it to the discourses of integration:

- O We've to plan Chelsea's integration Amy's integration sorry up to Lochhead.
- C Uh-huh. She's really more than ready to start.
- O Yes.

Caro picked up on the 'plan' metaphor and offered her 'assessment' that *she's really more than ready to start*. Caro's self-positioning in relation to the *plan* metaphor was that of assessor of Amy. Caro, the language unit SLT, took up a position at ease with making an unequivocal pronouncement of Amy's readiness for her move to the new school. Orla's *yes* constituted her acceptance of and agreement with Caro's construction.

The position that was acceptable to Caro in relation to the *plan* metaphor was that of assessor. Speaking of Chelsea's integration, Caro asserted:

- C Yes I re-assessed her and she's age appropriate with everything apart from her auditory memory and that's not crazily bad.
- O Mhm. She's very much part of the class.
- A Yes.
- C She's just lazy.
- O Yes, yes.

Identifying with *I re-assessed*, Caro positioned herself as able to do assessment, to interpret 'assessment results'. She was empowered to initiate matters of assessment here, legitimated to define what constitutes appropriate knowledge and practice. She appeared to identify with the policy discourses' position that SLTs contributed 'expert' and 'specialist' language assessment knowledge to planning. Caro represented her practice in re-assessing as objective, legitimate and normal in the contingencies of this

specific cultural setting - as the language unit SLT she inserted linguistic assessment disciplinary knowledge/practice.

Caro's assessment move prepared the ground for the assessment outcome - or her linguistics specialist 'diagnosis' of Chelsea which followed - *she's age appropriate with everything apart from her auditory memory and that's not crazily bad*. A norm of Caro's planning meeting practice was to introduce evidence in the case of each child individually, to build a separate 'case' in what appeared to be a health discourse/practice case-based problem-diagnosis approach to education programme planning. Caro identified with an individual problem identification and specification or 'case' approach, taking up the subject position of provider of assessment evidence. Identifying with a 'case' approach, Caro introduced the powerful disciplinary discourses of SLT agency and constituted those discourses as appropriate and legitimate in this education site.

Caro's assertions built her position as able to assess and profess 'objective facts' in the case of Chelsea - although she did not articulate the specific assessment practice and techniques or materials used. Anna and Orla unquestioningly accepted Caro's assessment assertions. It would seem that assumptions of the 'objective reality' of assessment discourses had imposed themselves so thoroughly on Caro and on the teachers, that they functioned as if that discourse was 'the truth' and not open to question.

Caro, in centralizing linguistic assessment, was operating in her knowledge and skill comfort zone. Introducing and centralizing assessment power/knowledge which in an objective view 'speaks for itself', prohibited any challenge from the others. As Other, non-linguistic assessment voices, their views were excluded. Such positionalities ostensibly benefited Caro in the balance of power in their relationships. But, Orla and Anna, in refusing to seek to appropriate the power/knowledge of assessment, benefited by imposing full responsibility for that work on Caro - a subject position seemingly acceptable to Caro.

Thus, one effect of Caro's discursive manoeuvres foregrounding her disciplinary speciality of linguistic assessment was to silence Orla and Anna. They may have accepted Caro's assessment discourses' authority and legitimizations or, they may have felt 'dis-abled' by Caro's constitution of things, lacking assessment power/knowledge and discourse/practice abilities and powerless to re-define things. In the power balance of this relationship, Caro's autonomous practices of 'assess-ability' drew on the discursive resources of the linguistics' disciplinary power/knowledge base. The assessment-knower positions which Caro constructed seemed to be acceptable to Anna and Orla, perhaps because her production of that knowledge for them facilitated the overall smooth running of the work of the unit, and their teacher subjectivities were aligned with powerful school institutional discourses of 'effective provision' and 'productive collaboration'. Caro's autonomous assessment practice seemed to be controlled by the compelling discourses of 'autonomous specialist professionalism'- her professional dressage had schooled her into health professional practices of self-

reliance and autonomous decision-making and action. In a sense, Caro may have been performing as an audience-centred 'language assessment professional', manifesting her knowledge and deploying it in these particular dominance ways for her partners and *via* the audiotape for this research and me.

Caro reconstructed her subject position with the assertion *she's just lazy*. Her assertion, identifying another problem in the case of Chelsea, in this instance, non-linguistic, worked the tactical move of signalling her identification with the powerful educational-psychological discourses of moral and behavioural assessment/judgement. Her reductive, reifying assertion that Chelsea *is just lazy* harnessed her previous identification with authoritative linguistic assessment enunciations and signalled her acceptance of the informal discursive resources of education and the disciplinary discourses of psychology. She also perhaps signalled her self-positioning as school-site practitioner equipped with the power/knowledge to make assertions about Chelsea's social, moral and behavioural traits. Anna's *yes, yes* move positioned herself as in collusion, tactically colliding in her agreement with Caro's *she's just lazy* assertion although any 'objective criteria' influencing Caro's assertions about this child remained unspoken.

In Caro's *big worry* move, she identified with the powerful 'effective collaboration' policy discourses of 'partnership with parents' and 'parental satisfaction with the provision'. These new discourses, manifested in a series of policy moves, had influenced a changed agenda, working to make practitioners attend to parents' views

and aspirations. However, Caro's subsequent move authoritatively dismissed Chelsea's mother's *big worry* about the availability of therapy at the other school:

- C Now her mum's big worry was that she would need therapy and there wasn't anybody at that school. But I don't think she's going to need any so.
- O It's basically making the school aware and mum aware of her inclination to be on the lazy side.
- C Very much on the lazy side. And they know about the multisyllable words that they've got to teach her. And they 'll 've seen how her parents before she goes.
- O Right.
- C So and I wouldn't. I wouldn't envisage that she'd need anything. I would suggest a six months review.

Having fleetingly introduced the parent's aspirations for Chelsea's *plan*, Caro resisted the policy values, norms and standards of making the parents' views and aspirations central in planning decisions. She authoritatively re-positioned herself, in the move *I don't think she's going to need any*, dismissing the parent's worry which she had just introduced and depicted as *big* or serious. In these language unit relationships, Caro's specialist-assessor and therapist-authority identities functioned to ensure acceptance of her autonomous assertions of appropriate practice that in Chelsea's case, in her view, no therapy is required. Her manoeuvres silenced any challenge to her knowledgeable disciplinary/agency-specialist position on this therapy matter - Orla and Anna accepted without question Caro's self-positioning as assessor-of-therapy-need specialist.

Orla signalled her collusion with Caro's position on Chelsea's assessed SLT needs, and in the same move introduced the discourses of 'the programme', her preferred plan for Chelsea. She harnessed Caro's 'expert' prescription of no speech therapy in the next school in the move *it's basically making the school aware and mum aware of her inclination to be on the lazy side*. Orla deployed *basically* in a minimization strategy. *Basically* functioned to constitute *making the school...and mum aware* as normal and unproblematic, 'the usual routine'. Orla tactically harnessed Caro's attribution of *lazy*. She harnessed the force of 'the norm' in portraying Chelsea as *on the lazy side*. Orla tactically reified the child's laziness and authoritatively asserted the plan that Chelsea's 'essential' characteristic of laziness, the reality of the child *being on the lazy side* should be reported to the child's mother and next school to be taken account of in Chelsea's future social/educational 'programme'. On this matter, Orla and Caro tactically collided in their self-positionings. Caro's SLT assessment had, for Orla, identified the 'essential problem' in 'Chelsea's case' which inserted an opening for Orla to introduce her 'normal educational programme in response' move *it's basically making ...aware of her...on the lazy side*.

Caro's *very much on the lazy side* manoeuvre functioned to build-up the severity and seriousness of the degree of laziness. The effects for the child, mother and new school relationships of Caro's reifying *lazy* assertion were not spoken. It is the discursive effects of the *lazy* label, which proliferated. Orla promoted an agenda of assumptions for mother and school for Chelsea's future management - a programme influenced by

Caro's discursive manoeuvres, the 'reality' that Chelsea *is lazy*. Orla and Caro's positions collided on normal language unit practice - how to treat or plan a co-ordinated home/school social programme in response to Caro's manoeuvre which pinned down the problem in the case of Chelsea as essentially being *just lazy*.

Orla and Caro constructed colluding positions in relation to Chelsea's behaviour not, for example, in terms of any formal discourses of child development assessment but solely against the unspoken norms of the 'common sense' lazy/hardworking binary. Orla and Caro jointly constructed a smooth account reifying Chelsea as lazy. They were both at ease in their positionalities, operating with/in the discourses of social and behavioural judgement. The effects of Caro's *just lazy* manoeuvre shifted from Caro's previous specialist assessment of Chelsea into the programme implications area of the *plan* where Orla could, with ease, take up a colluding position. Each also constructed their position perhaps as 'responding effectively' to 'Chelsea's problem' in compliance with their agencies' collaboration policy norms.

Speaking of Steffi, the third child, Caro deployed the *she's definitely suited for here* move:

- C She's definitely suited for here.
- O Oh yes without a doubt [laughter].
- C I've done a Reynell Assessment. I didn't do a CELF because she'd only did one before and there's no way that she would have achieved.

- O Achieved anything with it.
- C So it was a bit pointless. But I did a Reynell and she. Again you have to pin her down to respond to the question you were asking and go over them because she just wanted to play yes at her own games and things. But she came out at four point six with comprehension. Which is not too bad really.
- O It's not too bad is it?
- C And she's six one.

Caro's use of *definitely* worked to intensify her *suitied for here* assertion. Caro's authoritative assessor identity functioned to constitute her view of the child as legitimate, as unproblematically 'the truth'. Caro's discursive manoeuvre functioned to discount any opposing view as lacking knowledge of Steffi and of the suitability criteria for *here*. Caro constituted the child as *suitied for here* or in the category of 'language unit child', pre-empting any contrary argument with the term *definitely*. Caro's *definitely suitied for here* move also signalled her self-positioning as knowledgeable about the suitability norms for placement in this educational site - transgressing her previous autonomous SLT identity positions, she identified with a position of intra-institutional educational site knower. Caro, speaking as institutional insider-knower, had positioned herself most effectively to ensure that her view of Steffi's language unit suitability prevailed. Anna articulated total agreement with Caro's assessment in the move *oh yes*. [laughter] *without a doubt*. Both Caro and Anna identified comfortably with the discourses of language unit suitability; they each took up identity positions of language unit referrals/admissions knowers. On the matter of

suiting for here, Anna had a voice and asserted her position. Anna transgressed her previous position of silence on Caro's linguistic assessment assertions, inserting her position of agreement on this educational matter of suitability for the language unit programme.

Caro spoke of the assessment tool that she has used:

- C I've done a Reynell assessment. I didn't do a CELF because she only did one before and there's no way that she could have achieved.
- O Achieved anything with it.
- C So it was a bit pointless.

Caro subsequently used the 'objective results' of this formal assessment to legitimate her classificatory assertions. Caro unproblematically downplayed not using another named test. She asserted that the child *only did one before*, then knowledgeably and 'reasonably' asserted *there's no way that she would have achieved*. Caro's *no way* manoeuvre functioned to intensify and extrematize her prejudgement that what the child would have achieved would not have changed. Anna articulated agreement with Caro's assertion in the move *achieved anything with it*. Anna had imposed Caro's authority on assessment matters on herself. She was self-governed by accountability to Caro for 'real' knowledge about the child's assessment and 'progress'. Caro closed down discussion of the use and worth of possible alternative tests deploying the discursive manoeuvre *so it was a bit pointless*. Caro's *pointless* attribution functioned to make her

non-use of the test reasonable and unproblematic, just common sense. The combinatory effect of Caro's discursive manoeuvres was to silence any oppositional discourses.

Caro tactically shifted the terrain, re-introducing her preferred discourses of language assessment or testing:

C But I did a Reynell and...she came out at four point six with comprehension.

Which is not too bad really.

O It's not too bad is it?

C And she's six one.

Caro unquestioningly identified with the powerful SLT disciplinary testing and assessment discourses - the 'true result' of the test representing the child's 'real' achievement legitimated by the test's norms. Orla's move *it's not too bad is it?* constructed a complex self-positioning of considering the result, uncertainty about its meaning and identification with Caro's 'assessment expert' view of the result. Orla's equivocal enunciation functioned to cede power to Caro on the assessment matter. Orla, perhaps uncertain about what the test outcome meant, took up a position of accountability to Caro for 'true knowledge' about language assessment and the child's 'progress'.

Caro introduced the assessment discourses' 'fact' of the child's chronological age in the manoeuvre *and she's six one* as the 'norm' or standard against which the child's

achievement of *four point six* should legitimately be judged. Caro identified with the powerful disciplinary linguistic assessment discourses, a positionality accepted by Anna and Orla. Caro's assessment results enunciations secured the others' attention and cooperation- their compliance on her terms. Caro's introductions of formal language assessment discourses operated to silence the others' voices and exclude their views on the matter. Caro constructed and reconstructed her position as provider of specialist diagnosis. She positioned herself and was accepted by Anna and Orla as knower of the 'valid' and 'unbiased' knowledge of the test instrument - the question of the assessor's subjective judgement was not opened up in this setting.

Caro constructed herself as authoritative assessor-knower of the *problems* in this child's case:

- C She's got problems with prepositions and 'wh'. As things start to get more abstract she loses it completely. But negatives she's not too bad with. 'Which one's not been put in the field?' she can cope with. But little things like 'put all except' she can't do. Some of it is she can't handle the length of the command.
- O Yes.

Caro identified comfortably with the powerful SLT problem identification and assessment discourses and the SLT and education support for learning practices of problem-based planning. In the delicate power balances of this collaboration relationship, Anna and Orla appeared recurringly to be comfortable unquestioningly

accepting Caro's discourses/practices and multiple authoritative power/knowledge subject positions in relation to matters of formal language assessment of 'problems'.

In Caro's *need to do* move, she transgressively identified with the powerful education discourses' norm of planning and the support teaching focus on the need to plan the educational programme:

- C Her grammar is all in the 'here and now'. There's no past tenses, future tenses anything like that. And with all that she came out at about three years four months.
- O Mhm which is quite a way.
- C She's almost off the standard score at minus three point one. So.
- O And she talks about Steffi this Steffi that quite a lot.
- C Yes.
- O Which.
- C It's terribly immature.
- O Again it's an immature thing to do.
- C So again we need to build up knowledge of prepositions build up vocabulary. Really encourage her expressive language in just giving you information on things she's seen.
- O Right.
- C Rather than giving her the scaffolding but getting her just to say it rather than
- O Mhm.

- C than speaking too much to her and keeping her
- O on the topic
- C on track.
- O Right. Mhm.

Caro articulated her agenda for the child's programme, a position of authoritatively establishing the strategies and approaches that the teachers should use. Having autonomously decided what constituted appropriate knowledges and practices, her position was to obtain the teachers' compliance with her teaching approaches agenda. Caro reconstructed her 'linguistics specialist' identity position, introducing the technical terms and the technologies of linguistics discourses, *prepositions*, *vocabulary*, *expressive language*, *information*, *scaffolding*, *keeping on track*.

Caro positioned herself as specialist disciplinary assessor of needs and expert knower of approaches. She then transgressively appropriated the powerful education programme planning discourses and reconstructed herself as adviser and director of the others. She positioned herself as the one whose knowledge and practice aspirations were paramount in the moves *giving you*, *giving her*, *getting her*, and *keeping her*. Her constructed and reconstructed language assessor identities functioned to silence any introduction by the others of alternative approaches or counter-discourses. Anna and Orla accepted the 'benefits' of Caro's assessment of language problems' knowledge. They also, transiently, in these moments, accepted subject positions of accountability to Caro's identity position of education programme strategies and approaches expert.

Caro introduced her preferred education programme 'matter-of-factly' or 'reasonably', as the usual, the norm in their co-practice:

C Right, so it's lots of games with prepositions. Get her att. Well get her attention when you're talking to her. But you do that anyway. But making sure that when you're asking her or giving her information that she does carry them out and that she does answer appropriately.

O Mhm.

C So that you're keeping her with you.

O Mhm.

Caro's discursive manoeuvres linked her programme aspirations to her authoritative plan for their 'correct' implementation by Orla and Anna. Caro's position, in keeping with her disciplinary background, was to assess and name-label individuals' problems, to create cases, and then to match those 'problems' to her plan for their solution. Caro recurrently inserted knowledgeable direction *you're talking, you do, you're asking* and *you're keeping*. Caro's self-positioning as autonomous solver of Steffi's problems silenced Anna and Orla - they may have accepted that they lacked the specialist disciplinary knowledge which Caro applied to identify and to plan to solve the problems in the case of Steffi. Or, they may have thought it acceptable for teachers in a language unit not to seek to influence SLT diagnoses and treatment plans.

Orla and Anna may have benefited from Caro's opening-up of her knowledge bases to them, but Caro's insertions of linguistic discourses' knowledge recurringly made the others subject to and accountable to her. Caro's discursive tactics of expertly informing, instructing and reassuring Orla and Anna functioned, at moments, to dominate the others. Her position of keeping back and not sharing her professional language in relation to linguistic knowledge and assessment practice perhaps kept the others accountable to her for transmission of her linguistic disciplinary knowledge and for planning direction of their practice. Caro constructed and reconstructed personally acceptable subject positions as Orla's and Anna's specialist informant and adviser, able to plan appropriate approaches and pedagogies for them to implement.

Caro constructed and reconstructed multiple identity positions of assessor, problem identifier and also, in a discourse/practice transgressive of earlier disciplinary and professional discourses' norms, as education programme planning authority in the setting. In these historically contingent moments, Anna, Orla and Caro exploited their discourse resources to achieve a balance of power seemingly acceptable to all - acceptance of Caro's dominant position in relation to planning educational programme approaches may have constituted their interdisciplinary co-operation norm and Anna's and Orla's preferred co-operative style. The research recording may have produced strategies of silence from Orla and Anna in relation to linguistic assessment and approaches discourses. Silence may have been a more comfortable positionality, rather than committing themselves to particular positions and identifications within the linguistic assessment discourses in these situated and contingent conditions.

Reflexive aside: writing this chapter, aware of the issues thrown-up by the 'crisis of representation' (see, for example, Jameson in Lyotard, 1984, viii foreword, and Scheurich, 1997, 162), I have struggled against my tendencies to 'burrow to the heart of things' (to paraphrase Foucault, 1972, 229), to seek motivations and rationalizations and to textually represent 'authoritative knowledge' of individuals' meanings. During my 'realist position' stage, I viewed the meetings as sites for gathering information about these subjects, objectifying the lived experiences of these people. However, I was most ill at ease with that positioning of others and me. Seeking a self-distancing researcher-position, and seeking to impose a coherent and ordered form, I resorted to attempting to hide behind the techniques of systematicity. I produced a text which presented a methodical series of sequenced 'sociolinguistic' transcriptions and analyses. That I was not present in the meetings added to my textual attempts to construct the illusion of 'getting at people's true thoughts'. I operated in the 'illusion of fact presentation' comfort zones of psychological

and linguistic knowledges and practices, seeking the 'essential self' and 'real thinking' about collaboration of these individuals. Using these representational technologies, I was attempting to establish 'objectivity' and the 'truth' of my account. I began to accept that there were no essential selves, truths and realities to get at, to be found 'out there', but only different, multiple selves performed by these individuals as they spoke from different subject positions, subject to the powerful discourses and working the discourses' resources. I sensed that participants' identifications would be manifested in their metaphors - the position of Butler (cited in Denzin, 2001, 26) that 'identity is performatively constituted by the very 'expressions' that are said to be its results'. I struggled with the metaphors in my attempts to show in depth how these worked in practice as I sought to explore individuals' positionalities in the functioning of the discourses in the texts I had selected. I had begun to view the meetings as sites where these individuals were actively exploiting the discourses to continually construct new identity positions. I tried to experiment with different ways to introduce the

participants' accounts, shifting from my previous transcription-analysis presentations of the meeting texts. I became aware of my tendency to reify. Accepting Lather's (1993) position that discourse is important because it 'worlds the world' (675), framing how we think and know things, knowing of my reifying tendencies with/in my discursive resources was an important piece of learning. In my approach above, I sought to identify some of the metaphors participants mobilized to foreground some of the Foucauldian agonistic struggles around them. I am aware that my text is very dense and hard to read. Perhaps the complexity of my analysis, attempting to unravel individuals' multiple and motile positions, accounts for the difficulty and density of my text. I sought to unsettle participants' smooth stories; I endeavoured to examine the little manoeuvres and moves by which the individuals shift power in the relationships as they continually reconstruct their identifications within the powerful discourses and simultaneously exploit the discourses' resources in their ongoing struggles.

In this chapter I explored how participants' metaphors constitute the confluences of the workings of policies' constructions and people's active constructions of subject positions. The metaphors manifested people's constructions of values, positions and identities as they work the discourses, to re-position themselves and to fluidly reconstruct transitory, contingent and comfortable self-identifications in ways that are acceptable to the Other. In chapter 10 which follows, I offer an analysis of the interaction of the power-knowledge relations found in the functioning of the metaphors in specific socio-cultural settings. I analyse the functioning of the metaphors of collaboration as they manifest their effects in concrete power struggles that productively entangled five specific dimensions of power.

CHAPTER 10

POWER RELATIONS IN THE COLLABORATIONS

In this chapter I use Foucault's tools to analyse the cultural situation of the metaphors which I examined in the previous chapter as they operated in participants' texts. I also use the previous chapter's discourse analysis of the actual constitution of knowledge/power relations as a route to deciphering the political operating of these specific collaboration relationships. How does the accumulation of the power relation manifested in the exteriority of discourse operate in the political, social and cultural situation of these individuals' practices in these three institutions?

In chapter 9 I introduced the metaphors of teachers and therapists, which signal something of those individuals' oscillating identifications and self-subjectifications as they draw on different discourses to construct a variety of identity positions in relation to collaboration. In that chapter, drawing on the position of Derrida (in Cahoone, 2003) that 'the signified concept is never present in itself, in an adequate presence that would refer only to itself' (230), I sought to examine the surface of the discourses signified in metaphor. Foucault's (1972) rules and principles of exclusion were borrowed to examine the power relations in teachers and therapists' discursive formations. In chapter 9 I uncovered some of the power issues in the discursive effects of teachers' and therapists' talk in collaborative provision meeting events. My analysis of the discursive effects in collaborative partners' meeting talk in the previous chapter suggested the

need to decipher the specific social and political workings of these collaboration power relations.

In this chapter I further analyse the concrete, social and political operations of the specific power relations, which had been manifested in the discourse analysis offered in chapter 9. I explore how these power relations operated to form unique political situations for these teachers and therapists. To do so, I borrowed further from Foucault's box of analytical tools and make use of Bishop and Glynn's (1999) metaphors of 'initiation, benefits, representation, legitimation and accountability' (ibid. 54) to explore the power relationships. I first introduce certain of the intellectual, critical and analytical tools provided in the work of Foucault and discussed above in chapter 2. I then reintroduce Bishop and Glynn's (1999) model for examining issues of collaboration power relationships.

Borrowing from Ballard's (2002) discussion notes on Bishop and Glynn's (1999) model, the questions that I asked were:

- Initiation: who establishes the goals of the system? Whose interests and agenda is the education/ health system/institution established to promote? Who defines what constitutes appropriate knowledges and practices?
- Benefits: who will directly benefit from the education system/institution? How will speech and language therapists benefit from participation in the system?

- Representation: whose reality do the education/health system/institution and its constituent processes depict? In what ways do language support institution processes facilitate the voice of the participants? Whose cultural aspirations, preferences and prejudices are evident in the education/health system?
- Legitimation: what authority does the education/health system/institution have for its inception, structure, processes and outputs?
- Accountability: who are the teachers/therapists accountable to? Who gets to say so? How is teacher/therapist accountability demonstrated? How do I know?

Below, I attempt to treat participants' texts as part of the 'vast intertextual field' which no individual speaker 'can dominate' (to paraphrase Ward, 1997, 164). My reading seeks to disclose some of the connections between the dimensions of the collaboration relation. I seek instances of initiation, benefits, representation, legitimation and accountability metaphors operating in participants' enunciations and attempt to read these as devices that construct the collaborative relationship in these specific cultural contexts. The object of this analysis is discursive, to reveal how the things said in collaboration relationships constitute the concrete power of those relations.

Foucault (in Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982) suggests that power relations be identified and located and their point of application and methods analysed through the 'antagonism of strategies' (211). Foucault proposes an analysis that starts from the point of forms of resistance against forms of power. He considers the points which the struggles in the series of power oppositions that he has previously studied, have in

common. Below, some of Foucault's specific points concerning power relation struggles, which are used as tools in this analysis, are introduced.

Foucault's tools for analyzing power relations

The aim of these struggles is the power effects ... power over people's bodies, their health and their life and death (Foucault in Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982, 211)

There was undecidability in the experiences of teachers and therapists, placing them in and out of the collaboration relationships' power relations. For therapists, choice of bodily spatialization oscillated within, between and outwith the school institution's territoriality. Participants engaged in agonistic struggles, strategies of resistance of escape and avoidance in relation to the dimension of accountability in the power relation, seeking different and diverse individual and professional benefits from the collaboration relationships.

They are struggles which question the status of the individual... they assert the right to be different... On the other hand, they attack everything which ... ties him to his own identity in a constraining way (ibid. 211-212).

Individuals' agency and non-agency were constantly shifting in immediate spontaneous struggles with close-up and personal instances of collaboration power acting on them.

Individuals were at times active subjects and at other times involved in agonistic struggles, strategies of resistance to the power effects of the other's discourses. Plural and spontaneous points of resistance were at work in strategies of professional and personal interest, compromise and sacrifice. Participants engaged in avoidance and concealment strategies of resistance to the initiation and legitimation of authoritative knowledges, processes and practices.

They are in opposition to the effects of power which are linked with knowledge, competence and qualification: struggles against the privileges of knowledge. But they are also an opposition against secrecy, deformation and mystifying representations imposed on people (ibid. 212)

There were differences and diversities in appeals to truth and knowledge. Participants constructed themselves and other people as experts, non-experts, agents, objects, thinkers, knowers, producers, non-knowers, learners, consumers and a myriad other relations to the knowledges which they self-imposed and imposed on others. There were resistances critiquing and defying the legitimation and reality representation of the dominant, authoritative language provision discourses.

these...struggles revolve around the question: Who are we? They are a refusal of these abstractions of economic and ideological state violence which ignore who we are individually, and also a refusal of a scientific or administrative inquisition which determines who one is (ibid. 212).

Participants had labelled themselves as teacher or therapist, partner, collaborator, we, you, us, the other. In the empirical material's discursive formations, individuals' self-identifications were fuzzy, fragmented, ambiguous and oscillating. In participants' mobilizations of metaphor there were contradictions, agonistic struggles against self-imposed and other-imposed initiation, representation and legitimation of essences, ideals, norms and standards constituting selves and others. These included, for example, self, the Other, language-knowledge expert, part-knower or non-knower, child development-knowledge knower or non-knower, school-systems knower, good collaborator, poor partner, supporter, supported. Following Foucault, participants were neither docile bodies nor fully autonomous but were active agents in constructing and reconstructing their own individual discourses, subjectivities and 'identity positions' (Harrison et al, 2003, 68). I now use Bishop and Glynn's (1999) framework to analyse the functioning of the dimensions of power in the selected accounts explored in the previous chapter.

Applying the power dimensions' analytical frame

This analysis was concerned with the power effects of the immediate struggles of individual teachers and therapists over who they are and their own and others' valuations of their knowledges, practice competencies. It attended to the techniques or forms of power applying itself to their relationships, which made these individuals subject to the other and subject or tied to their own previous professional identities. The methods of the techniques of power applying to teacher/therapist relationships are

identified and located and their strategies analysed using the analytical frame of the five dimensions of the issue of power proposed by Bishop and Glynn (1999).

The dimensions of initiation, benefits, representation, legitimation and accountability which Bishop and Glynn (*ibid.* 54) suggest for examining power relationships were developed in their work examining the dominance and subjection relationship between the indigenous Maori peoples and the dominant colonizing peoples in New Zealand. In particular, Bishop and Glynn's work was concerned with the issue of inclusion of Maori in New Zealand education. My analysis in chapter 9 of the operation of metaphor in participants' discourses suggested that there were imbalances in the sharing of power in collaboration in these teacher/therapist relationships. At times, participants experienced a lack of voice and a lack of power to have their desires and aspirations addressed. I borrowed the tools used in Bishop and Glynn's analysis of the patterns of dominance and subjection which can privilege and advantage one group and subject and oppress other people to examine those kinds of discursive effects of dominance and subjection which I outlined in chapter 9. That chapter examined how individuals' experiences were assigned differential value in partners' talk as partners imposed judgements on each other and individuals imposed politico-cultural aspirations on themselves.

In my analysis I sought to uncover something of the power effects functioning in the fuzzy and uncertain spaces of the discourses of collaboration. I attempted to decipher something of each individual's collaboration identities and aspirations in these specific social and cultural work sites. What follows is an analysis of the political, cultural and

social operation of the forces of power/knowledge and desire using the five metaphorical categories

Initiation: Whose interests and experiences were paramount?

- Freya initially put herself and her grouping desires before Ellen but in Freya and Ellen's collaboration relationship the interests of neither individual operated centrally or were paramount, there was no legitimizing hierarchical power of one over the other. The interests of both were 'points of resistance' (see, for example, Fontana and Bertani in Bertani and Fontana, 2003, 280) and sites of collaborative relationship 'agonistic struggles' (see, for example, Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982, 222 and Barker, 1998, 43 and 120) in the timetabling and grouping discussions. Freya's initiation of the grouping discussion privileged her own beliefs about the children's interests as 'school expert' and also opened up a discursive space for Ellen. Each accepted something of the other's voice on timetabling matters while actively inserting their own aspirations. Ellen's strategy in this power relation ostensibly constituted Freya as the grouping 'expert' but Ellen in a strategy of personal interest as a stakeholder in the outcome of timetabling discussions had imposed school timetabling and grouping discourses upon herself. Ellen brought in her SLT interests and language experience but she had also appropriated something of the language of the dominant school policy culture. Her knowledge of school discourses empowered her to challenge education assumptions and decisions. Ellen and Freya both constructed themselves as individuals able to act upon their beliefs about their own and others' interests within the assumptions of this discursive

formation. Ellen had a place in a shared new way of doing timetabling and grouping. Inserting her own personal and professional interests, Ellen acted to transgress the limits of the predetermined position first allocated to her by Freya.

- Hannah initially imposed her interests as central in the assumption drawn from her experience that utility, time and spatialization implications must prohibit and exclude certain collaboration practices in *the way that the set-up works* in the Glenian provision context. Hannah made paramount her own interests as a health employee. Hannah believed that her employment by health justified the prevailing arrangement of her spatial positioning out of school. Hannah believed in her positionality outwith school values and relationships and acted in that interest, only infrequently participating in school discursive practices and apparatuses. Hannah made paramount her personal and professional interests, her prior negative experience of doing collaboration in school justified her chosen out-of-school self-spatialization. Her assumption was of work outside the school-space. Hannah sought to present teachers' possible work of interest to SLTs using the legitimate discursive formations of education but was constrained by the limitations of her knowledge of educational practice and of the language of educational policy and practice that were outwith her experience. Hannah's prior experience of therapy knowledge bases and discourses relating to child development was inserted quite naturally as of paramount interest.

- Caro's experiences functioned as central and paramount at some points in her exchange with Anna and Orla, for example, in prescribing the teaching strategies, approaches and methodology that the teachers in the unit and receiving school should use to 'develop' Chelsea's language. Caro did not need to subjugate her identity and experience as SLT in this context but Anna and Orla had to subordinate their prior experiences and professional identities as teachers to the needs of the language unit goals, which were determined by Caro. At times Caro's initiation of her SLT experience as paramount was in the immediate interest of herself and of Anna and Orla who had not hitherto appropriated the knowledges that were legitimate and current in the language unit practices. However, the school had appropriated and used Caro's SLT knowledges to achieve the education system's objectives for this group of learners rather than having addressed the teachers' needs not to have their prior knowledges and their selves permanently marginalized and subordinate. School 'language remediation' goals were paramount and the prevailing education bolt-on response was to appropriate SLT knowledge and experience. There were ghettoizing and Othering effects of such practices within the wider school context. The SLT was culturally and micropolitically marginalized as was the language unit and the children it served. In a context of language unit privileging of SLT discourses and practices, the school-talk monolingual teachers working there were rendered as Other, made subordinate by the privileged dominant discourses of knowledge about language. It was by assimilating, by passing as having knowledge about language, that teachers rendered themselves legitimate professionals and collaborators. It was by acceptance of the wider

educational system's aspirations for the progress of children in the language unit and provision to teachers of simplified and technicist knowledge, commodified for their immediate needs and purpose, that the therapists' presence in school was justified. The education system's interests were paramount in its demand in language units for immediately available SLT knowledge for 'education' consumption and exploitation. The professional monolingualism of this therapist and these teachers rendered the teachers unable to exploit SLT disciplinary knowledge in the ways perhaps envisaged by HMI (1996). In their practice these teachers were dependent upon and appropriated and consumed SLT knowledges and experiences about practice.

Benefits: How did teacher and therapist benefit from participation in a collaboration relationship?

- Freya initially viewed Ellen as a resource to be drawn upon and used as she desired rather than valued as a partner whose perspective and sense-making should be included in the grouping and timetabling processes of the base. The benefits of participation in this collaboration relationship for Ellen included the opening of a space for resistance of Freya's autonomous decision-making and positioning of her and insertion of her voice as an equal stakeholder in how the time/grouping was to be regulated. Freya benefited from Ellen's challenge to her initial self-centred, independent conceptualization and the insertion of different possibilities for agreement in configuring their timetable. Ellen too benefited from imposing upon herself the language and discourses of the school knowledge culture. She respected

and valued the language and epistemological assumptions of education and could bring something of that to bear on to the benefit of all in the grouping practice process and outcomes. She benefited from prior and ongoing participation in collaboration by having appropriated the power/knowledge to problematize and re-think Freya's assumptions.

- Hannah endorsed the collaboration work which other SLTs did in classrooms, as a practice which worked 'quite nicely'. It was a joint practice of benefit to the user children, teachers and therapists. Roz described the benefit to teachers from participation in a collaborative relationship in which they received SLT assistance as 'huge'. Hannah believed that SLTs benefited from participation in a collaborative relationship by the practice of receiving information from teachers which SLTs could use to make knowledgeable recommendations to direct teachers' work. Roz assumed that SLTs benefited from teachers' feedback on children's learning. Hannah asserted that it was of benefit to SLTs for teachers to come and give information to SLTs as advisor-users of that knowledge. Roz suggested that school-based service-level agreements might better manage equality of opportunity of access to the therapist by teachers. Hannah's previous practices of accommodating the teachers' desire for in-school access to her had previously meant her subjection to belittling discourses and her subjecting herself to the discursive effects of these that called into question her professional standing and self-worth.

- At one level, Caro appeared to benefit most from participation in this collaboration relationship. All of these participants made current knowledge about language acquisition, development, assessment and testing and specialist approaches as the legitimate terrain of knowledges and practices in their unit context. Anna and Orla accepted Caro's knowledges and experiences as of immediate and instrumental benefit. Anna and Orla having bought into the 'reality' that SLT knowledge bases and experiences were paramount, benefited from Caro's presence as expert in those knowledges and practices, constantly in their midst and available as provider of information and certainty to them. Caro benefited at a personal level from the effects on this arrangement on her self-esteem but the personal effects for Anna and Orla of on-going professional uncertainty and permanent apprenticeship to Caro, were not, in the detail of their exchange here, beneficial. In the longer term, the disempowering and dependency effects of such a constant non-legitimation of their culture, language and experience and the masking and rejection of that required of them, were disbenefits for Anna and Caro. In the long term too, the demand on Caro to be the expert oracle in the context but always marginal, minimally and intermittently in, usually out, of wider education and school cultures and discourses was personally unrewarding with personal costs.

Representation: Whose cultural and discourse aspirations, preferences and prejudices were current?

- Initially, Freya's knowledge of education culture was used by her to prejudge the outcome at Ellen's expense. But Ellen's technique was to re-work Freya's initial

prejudgement of the issues according to her preferred aspirations. Education and school's wider cultural and discursive formations' assumptions and aspirations were deployed and read by both Freya and Ellen. Ellen's professional cultural preferences were inserted in her aspirations for linguistic knowledge and SLT planning requirements. Ellen revealed in her equating of SLT *outcome measures* to education culture and discourses in relation to planning that school preferences were the current realities of their joint work. Ellen's alternative SLT realities were placed at the margin by her rather than imposed on Freya as a requirement. At one level, cultural and linguistic assimilation appeared to be at work in Ellen's practices. She had imposed school language and culture upon herself but this was a professional self denial and protection strategy in the dominant discursive formations and culture of the aspirations and prejudices of the school space. An alternative reading might be that Ellen did not share her knowledge and experience of this SLT cultural reality with Freya. Ellen did not speak of her *outcomes measures* practice and knowledge to Freya. Ellen remained intact professionally having given little away of her relevant professional culture and discourses.

- Hannah spoke of the amount of training required in the school site, the impossibility of her undertaking such training and her preference to remain for the most part debarred from doing any training of school colleagues. Roz troubled Hannah's account of the way that she viewed and had hitherto limited training as the only choice. Roz reformulated the issue according to the preferences and aspirations of school culture and policy discourses. She suggested new ways of doing training by

means of the reasonable practices of working in the school, seeing the children and attending meetings. Hannah's cultural beliefs and prejudices of particular ways to do health and education acted to subjugate others as non-knowers of health agency rules. Hannah's prejudgements about the *basic things* knowledge and skills which teachers could give SLTs were re-worked by Roz as teachers providing SLTs with basic understanding of the curriculum. Hannah took up Roz's representation, suggesting that SLTs aspired to have teachers give them knowledge of teachers' expectations of children at different ages. Roz aspired to the new collaboration discourses and practices around agreements, prejudging any contrary view as self-interested. Hannah assumed the importance and worth of collaboration legitimized by *higher up* and enshrined in agreements' discourses and practices. Hannah aspired to a norm of rules to structure and govern in-school collaboration activity. The discursive preferences and prejudices of the headteacher, a forceful figure in school, had sought to dismiss Hannah's knowledge as inferior. Hannah had acted to remove herself bodily from the in-school individuals who had labelled her in ways unacceptable to her personal and professional selves.

- The preferences of Caro, the SLT professional, recurred in the discourses and culture of the language unit site. There was in-betweenness in the culture of the unit that had appropriated and privileged language and therapy discourses/practices and power/knowledge alongside the traditional, indigenous culture and discourses of the school. Discourse appropriation and cultural assimilation had not occurred; rather, an alternative cultural enclave with alternative dominant discourses had grown-up

in the language unit, risking a cultural apartheid. The preferred authoritative discourses in the unit were those of the disciplines of linguistics, language development, language testing, examination and assessment, para-medical diagnosis and linguistic clinician prescription. There was an alternative discourse of reintegration practices current in the talk of all three practitioners which assumed that children progress and move on and which believed that previous unit practice in this work was 'naturally the norm' against which decisions for Amy, Chelsea and Steffi should be made. Caro's preferred knowledge constituted the unit's dominant discourses of linguistics, language development, language testing, examination and assessment, diagnosis and prescription with their discursive effects of scientificity, authority and truth. Such a representation of aspirations, preferences and prejudices in the day-to-day reality of the unit produced power effects of exclusion of Anna's and Orla's backgrounds. Their cultural and disciplinary knowledge bases and discourses were recurrently prohibited as illegitimate by Caro's discursive strategies and Anna and Orla had imposed the inferiority and illegitimacy of their discourses upon themselves and in the exchanges labelled their own beliefs as less informed. Their aspirations and prejudices were marginalized in unit administration talk, in talk about grouping and child behaviour and as consumers of and conformers with Caro's preferred sense-making and preferences, aspirations and prejudices in her prescriptions. Caro imposed on Anna, Orla and the teachers in the receiving school her decisions, preferences and aspirations for learning activities and experiences, teaching strategies, approaches and methodology. Caro's cultural and discourse preferences and prejudices were current and paramount in the curriculum planning

work central to the professionalism of teachers. Anna and Orla accepted Caro's representation of reality as legitimate. Orla and Anna's preference for and aspiration to instrumentally appropriate Caro's professional cultural knowledge and practice was announced here in their lack of that knowledge. They had not taken up the discourses of linguistic assessment which were privileged in unit exchanges but did identify with the authority of the discourses of linguistics and of assessment.

Legitimation: Whose realities and experiences were legitimate?

- The 'pragmatic' realities and experiences of schoolwork practicalities and the research legitimized truths and realities of 'progressive' education policy documentation were deployed and accepted as legitimate by Ellen and by Freya. Ellen's assumptions about knowledge categorization and a belief in progress, attainment levels and expectations were accepted by both as realities in their interactions. Educationist 'truths' about children's mental functioning and 'ability' were accepted by both as realities. Ellen's reality of doing outcome measures was placed at the margin in their collaboration practice, reconceptualized by her in education's discursive formations. Ellen's alternative planning requirement realities were not legitimate 'ideals' in school practices to Ellen or Freya. There was a disjuncture in the shared understanding based on education discourse when Ellen inserted her professional linguistic and psycholinguistic specialist approach knowledge base reality. She risked discussion of her linguistic knowledge and experience and of her SLT planning practices but placed these at the margin as not of the essence of schoolwork. The policy documentation realities of both

professional groups, that speech and language therapists provided 'input' into IEP planning and that the 'paperwork' of this documentation be shared, were accepted by Ellen. IEP circulation was reconceptualized as a legitimate new reality of co-practice by Ellen and taken up and self-imposed as a future practice by Freya.

- Hannah's belief concerning the immutable, unalterable reality of the Glenian 'set-up' was initially current. The dominant notion in her discourse was of that unchanging reality, that the particular present set-up was the product of particular education/health, school/clinic systems' and structures' interfaces was not legitimate within her knowledge, preferred view and aspirations. Any notion that the current reality was self-perpetuating because Hannah refused to acknowledge any knowledges or views that would challenge and change things was not legitimate. Hannah had decided to impose the norm of spatialization exclusion on herself as a personal and professional self-protective strategy of avoidance of the 'disciplinary technologies' (to paraphrase Foucault, 1977, 215 and see, for example, Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982, 135) of the school institution. Hannah had decided that the surveillance and control of her discourses, practices and body attempted by education, school and headteacher discursive formations and practices, constituted inappropriate power/knowledge and practices. Roz suggested legitimate change to reformulate and re-form previous norms of practice which would have meant that Hannah would come into school. Roz delegitimizes the present normal practice of not doing training. Roz delegitimized the prevailing realities of Hannah's self-imposed strategy of spatialization out of school. Roz legitimized coming in as

warranted and contributing flexibility and diversity to the prevailing training norms in Glenian. Roz ignored and delegitimized Hannah's view of herself as expert on the knowledge that teachers should be given. Hannah constituted as legitimate the practices of the other SLTs, paid by education, in relation to coming in to work in classrooms. Roz used the education discourses' legitimation of the desirability of in-class work helping the understanding of the child and teacher to challenge as problematic Hannah's self-positioning out of school and classrooms. Hannah believed that agreements that carried the legitimizing power and authority of 'higher up' into the school, made legitimate her own presence in school. School management's negative labelling and belittling discourse which derided Hannah acted to disallow the notion of teachers working co-equally with her. Roz constituted the allowing of collaboration agreements by 'higher up' legitimating collaboration practice between teachers and therapists in schools and acting to delegitimize any oppositional discourses and culture that promoted non-collaboration.

- Orla, Anna and Caro accepted the dominant 'realities' of children's development, language development, learning and progress and therapeutic outcomes and progress as legitimate. These discursive formations were tied into the assumptions by all three practitioners of unit practices producing progress, that is moves to normalization and re-integration into mainstream schooling. Caro's experiences and realities of reintegration practices were dominant and accepted as legitimate by Anna and Orla. Anna and Orla labelled their own assumptions and beliefs about

reintegration decisions as less informed and lacking legitimacy. Caro's reality, beliefs and activities in relation to assessment techniques, practice, outcomes analysis and prescriptions were seen by her, and taken on themselves by Anna and Orla, as legitimate, warranted and normal in the unit context. Teachers and therapists had assimilated the assumptions of linguistic assessment discourses so thoroughly that any challenge to its truth and legitimacy was not only prohibited but also not even a possibility of thought. As exclusive knower of assessment discourses, Caro's experiences and beliefs were dominant and Orla and Anna were subject to the power effects of those 'essential' discourses. Anna and Orla's wider education and school discourses of assessment and testing were in part delegitimized by the reality within the unit of Caro's autonomous, 'objective' judgement on all matters of testing. Orla and Anna lacked the knowledge and discursive formations of language assessment and were dependent in this cultural context on Caro's sense making about test 'results'. Caro's professional background and experience was legitimate. Her realities were dominant in relation to suitable unit children, difficulties, degrees of difficulty, parents' needs, child's problems, behaviours and achievements, testing procedures and outcomes and about teachers' knowledge needs, curriculum content, approaches, practices and review decisions. Caro's realities and truths about test results and these other 'essential' language unit practices were accepted by Anna and Orla as warranted and legitimate and were imposed upon their selves. Caro's colonization of and dominant representation of the realities of curricular decision-making, prescription and direction of learning activities and experiences and of teaching approaches and strategies were

paramount. Her realities, knowledges and experiences were legitimate, unquestioned by the other practitioners in the knowledge and discourse dependency culture and power relationship in this interaction. The effects of Orla's and Anna's own beliefs about their own uncertainties, non-knowledge about what to do about the child's talk and non-legitimate knowledge bases for this context constituted Caro's reality as legitimate.

Accountability: Who decided what constituted appropriate knowledges and practices?

- Freya, at first, did not seek or value Ellen's knowledge in the timetabling exchange. Ellen contradicted this view of her imposed by Freya by actively producing her knowledge of school time/grouping beliefs, discourses and practices to open up a space for inclusion of her knowledge on the matter and a more shared conceptualization of time/grouping practice decisions. Ellen located herself in a space between teaching and therapy discourses. Ellen sought to insert school planning practice knowledge but oscillated back into her SLT planning knowledge bases at that point. She constituted education knowledges and practices as appropriate knowledges in the timetabling discussion. She moved between therapy and school planning discourses and practices. Her work spatialization was both in school and clinic/community. She was subject to certain of the school discourses and she had actively adapted certain of these to her work in school. Ellen actively constructed her own identity position in the work site. She identified with and had imposed on herself the policy and practice knowledges of in-school working and of the SLT knowing subject. Ellen at times constituted each of these as appropriate

knowledges and practices in this context. Ellen refused to be positioned or to position herself as 'the Other' in a relation of subjection to educational discourses; rather, she actively challenged the effects of the particular discursive formation and re-thought something of the terrain of their joint work. Freya actively imposed Ellen's re-conceptualized collaboration relationship practices of *good communication and shared paperwork* upon herself.

- Hannah constituted the training of teachers and her regulation of the timing and spatialization of that drawing on discourses of progress and development. Hannah constituted such training practices and the assumptions about knowledge on which they were based as appropriate knowledges in the particular Glenian context. Hannah's belief and unquestioning acceptance of the reality of the constraining limits of the present configuration of their 'set up' were based on her decision that managerialist and systems theory assumptions about agency level organization, structures, boundaries and barriers were appropriate knowledges. These knowledges had imposed themselves on Hannah and she continued to impose their implications for the constitution of appropriate practice on herself and on others. Hannah legitimated the accountability of practitioners in terms of the employment relation. It was the reality of employer and of payment by either education or health which decided the appropriate practice of working in or out of school. Hannah believed that appropriate collaboration practice was for teachers to speak to therapists about the basic things. Hannah decided that the belittling labelling of her relied upon the school institution's hierarchy and culture for its currency and distribution. Hannah,

in her resistances, refused to accept the conditions of its effects as appropriate knowledge of her as practitioner or as self-knowledge of her own value and worth. She sought the freedom and insubordination of liberation, the 'means of escape or possible flight' (Foucault in Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982, 225), from the struggles of this specific power relationship. Hannah decided in such conditions, to appropriate the exclusive right to act in ways appropriate to her beliefs about herself by choosing to work outwith school as an appropriate practice most of the time.

- Orla, Anna and Caro had each decided what constituted appropriate language unit context knowledges and practices. Caro decided that her 'assessment' knowledges and experiences of practice were the appropriate discursive formations that constituted 'readiness for reintegration' in this context. Anna and Orla constituted their own knowledges and experiences of reintegration practices as less informed, undecided in their appropriateness. Caro constituted as appropriate her own knowledge and practice decisions about what Chelsea needed and would get, reintegrating into mainstream. She labelled Chelsea as lazy and dismissed Chelsea's mother's worry. She was accountable to herself in these knowledge and practice matters. Orla functioned as accountable to Caro, led by Caro's knowledge and judgement in deciding to inform Chelsea's new school and her mother that no speech therapy was needed and that Chelsea was lazy. Orla and Anna functioned as directed by and accountable to Caro, for example through imposing on themselves the 'true' superior and unchallengeable knowledges, techniques and practices of language assessment and results' facts, interpretations, judgements and

recommendations produced by Caro. Caro, Anna and Orla each decided that Caro's knowledge of 'essential' learning activities and of 'memory side' constituted appropriate knowledges in the unit context. Caro decided to 'envisage' and produce these knowledges and the related practice of 'suggesting', passing on this information to Chelsea's receiving school. Anna and Orla, lacking linguistic knowledge and discursive resources, subordinated themselves to that SLT perspective, constitution and initiative. The curriculum within the unit, passed on to the receiving school and then reviewed in the unit, remained geared to the knowledges and aspirations of the SLT professional. Caro decided what constituted appropriate learning and teaching practices. She deemed a variety of SLT and educational disciplinary knowledge bases appropriate. For example, she drew on linguistics, pragmatics, and learning theory knowledges. Caro had appropriated education knowledge of the value of fun and motivation in 'games' activities. She prescribed 'lots of games' and, more directly, a list of instructions for their implementation as appropriate learning and teaching activities and practices for teachers in this context. Caro decided that eclectic use of education and SLT knowledges and discursive formations was appropriate for her in this context. The effects of that power/knowledge constituted Anna's and Orla's predominantly education knowledges and discourses as inferior and subordinate. Orla and Anna decided that knowledge about language development and strategies for language acquisition were appropriate knowledges and practices. They each imposed on themselves and their knowledges the evaluation that they were uncertain and deficient. Each decided that they lacked the knowledge about language and of

practices constituted as appropriate in this context and that for information, instruction and direction they were dependent upon Caro and accountable to SLT knowledges and practices.

Slipping into something more comfortable: what does this analysis suggest?

This analysis of the empirical material suggests that individuals engaged in agonistic struggles and dispositions in relation to the two 'technologies of power' (Dreyfus and Rabinow, 1982, 144), one which produced collaboration and the other which produced autonomous professionalism or control teachers' and therapists' lives and work at a distance. The analysis uncovered the 'disciplinary mechanisms' (Foucault, 1977, 209) making individuals as collaborators and as autonomous professionals at work. Furthermore, these and related discourses were actively used by individuals to continually reconstruct their identifications and identity positions in relation to collaboration relations. The analysis would suggest that while policy discourse seeks to construct teacher/therapist school site collaboration in particular ways, practitioners differentially appropriated authoritative collaboration discourses and adapted these to their specific work circumstances. The data analysed here suggest a destined failure of collaboration because of the way that talking the talk of collaboration, in practice, allowed people to remain intact and autonomous professionally and personally, giving little away in their relations with the other.

Participants oscillated in and out of their different collaborator subjectivities and other self-subjectivizations in their agonistic struggles around the dimensions of power in

their collaborations. They produced ambivalences, undecidabilities and unwillingnesses in their collaborations and displayed productive power, resistances, dissidence and refusals of ways of doing collaboration. Participants' self-subjectivizations included school-culture-knower, assessment-provider, prescription-provider, clinician-colonizer, docile-accomplice, passive-recipient, affective-relater, assistance-desirer, non-contact transgression-aspirer, alienation-ameliorator, non-assistance-protestor, self-imposed territorial-apartheidist, at-a-distance-assistant, organizational-orchestrator, organizational-subverter, otherness-embracer, cultural-practice-transgressor, experimental-transformer and mutual-practice-fulfilment-seekers. In Inverian, Orla and Anna manifested passive and docile acceptance of their lack of assessment and prescription power. With Caro, they each slipped into more comfortable affective identities. Hannah found a means of freedom and escape from the personally unacceptable effects of her specific power struggles, slipping away in transgressive strategies of insubordination and flight. Hannah's non-acceptance of what was happening in the cultural setting of Glenian produced her oscillations into her previous allegiance to a positive productive autonomous self. Roz's non-acceptance of Hannah's distancing strategies was manifested in her ongoing struggles against that practice. Ellen and Freya each manifested non-acceptances of themselves as passive in their relations in the Benian cultural setting. They were both thoroughly and productively engaged in cultural struggles. Each, in their tactical collisions, gave something to the other that produced something of a mutual fulfilment of their own and the other's tactical aspirations.

Through the disciplinary power and dressage constitutive of 'professionalism' participants, subject to an apparatus of professionalization, had subjected themselves to the knowledge-power practices of a professional group. They had each taken on and continue to slip in and out of different specific self-identifications with 'professional' forms of self-government producing colonizations, compliances and tactical collidings of aspirations.

The participants were thoroughly enmeshed in their specific collaboration relationship's arrangement of power/knowledge as subjects and agents in that relation's dominations and subjections. Participants were continuously engaged in individual struggles to influence the means of production of their specific relationship. They sought to dominate their collaboration formation's equilibrium and to alter to their advantage the network of power relations constitutive of their specific collaboration relationship.

In the final chapter, which follows, I suggest some implications for practice which might be drawn from this analysis.

CHAPTER 11

WHEN ALL IS SAID AND DONE: SOME POSSIBILITIES

Throughout this research my research student-beginner researcher selves have struggled against my practitioner/lecturer selves' tendencies to be normative, to jump to conclusions; and against my seemingly incessant practitioner need to identify implications for practice - my own and others'. Perhaps now is the appropriate point to suggest that this research might have implications for practice. The approach to collaboration power relations taken in this analysis produced the questions and suggestions that follow:

Is there is a need to explore what teachers/therapists want to happen with collaboration?

My analysis would suggest that individuals need freedom to choose to re-think the prevailing central ideas and norms of collaboration. The notion of collaboration might be grappled with in diverse ways that are not shut-down and exclusively bounded by the categorizations of scientificist knowledge or by a 'tyranny of the intellect that assumes the unknown to be irrelevant' (Bernauer, 1990, 4). My analysis suggested the need for a better meeting of peoples' hearts and minds about the possibilities of variety and differences in collaboration discourses. My analysis would suggest the need for a focus on the interests and desires of the children and parent users who experience therapists' and teachers' joint services. Teachers' and therapists' managers and leaders might introduce a range of possibilities for learning and sharing together. Such shared

contexts might draw on both professional groups' traditions of knowledges, practices and processes, empower each to appropriate something of the forces of power/knowledge of the other and provide openings for each to escape the confinements and transgress the limitations of their current thinking. Spaces and openings that will challenge individuals' beliefs that current collaboration set-ups are unchanging realities and the only possible true versions should be sought. Such opportunities are needed to shake peoples' assumptions which reify what people know, believe and value as the one true way of doing collaboration and reject what is unknown to themselves as illegitimate or irrelevant.

Do school institutions need to change and re-configure to include potential collaborators from other professions and agencies?

If schools desire and actively seek to impose upon themselves a belief 'in building effective partnerships with other agencies which support children and families' (SEED, 2002, 16), they will require to include those agencies' practitioners. Schools must shift existing cultures of exploitation, toleration or non-acceptance of non-education or para-education professionals. My analysis would suggest that schools might begin to deploy flexible and creative thinking in ways that seek to shift present systems and structures and even transgress existing disciplinary boundaries. Schools should examine and be prepared to change the constitution of relationships with other professional groups to better configure the underpinnings that create possibilities of co-operative work. What have hitherto functioned as schools' spatial arrangements and conceptual and attitudinal norms will need to be re-thought to avoid individuals' physical, cultural and

micropolitical marginalization and ghettoisation as Other. For all to experience benefits from participation in a school-based collaboration relationship, schools have to take on new more personally rewarding practices that open up to all the people who work in them the freedom of acceptance and self-acceptance. School institutions' reconfigurings will not be 'one-size fits all' and will not be 'a once and for all'. Schools will need to be vigilant, sensitive and responsive to individuals' or professional groups' re-thinking, to remain open to taking upon the institutional form the changing and emerging needs of all the people who work together there.

Do schools and agencies that work with/in schools need to break with present possible 'true' propositions about collaboration, to put collaboration to work differently and differentiatedly in future?

The apparent current consensus, entrenching autonomous-professional identities that constrains collaboration and limits collaboration possibilities by the 'truth' of present professional groups' policy and contractual documentation, needs to be challenged. There is a need to break out of the present 'true' thought and practice of collaboration which is impressed upon individuals in their professional upbringing and continues to press in upon them in their working life, confining them in their possibilities for practice. Rather than speaking of an 'essential' strategic vision and 'ideals' of aims and objectives and a once-and-for-all reified understanding of the contribution that each agency can make according to their policy and present practice, these essences, ideals and reifications need to be questioned. My analysis would suggest that ways should be sought for agencies and individuals to question the 'truths' of present collaboration

philosophies, policies and practices. Agencies need to break with their need and impulses to preserve and defend obsolete spatial, hierarchical, examined-knowledge demarcations of practice within policy and view all knowledge as provisional and open to question. Interagency collaboration needs to be grasped in what it presently is: a preservation of influence and control tied to existing configurations of power/knowledge often oppressive of others. If practitioners are to feel at ease in doing collaboration, rather than feeling that they lack the 'essential' knowledge or 'ideal' skills for practice, present 'norms' of interagency relations must be transformed and rethought. Practitioners need to transgress existing delimitations and demarcations of practice and experiment with transformations that will reconstitute collaboration in ways that are more acceptable to them.

How might individual collaboration ventures be valued appropriately in ways that draw on individuals' voices and local knowledges?

Individual practitioners are thoroughly enmeshed in self and peer examinations, legitimate questioning and critique of their own collaboration practices. In their doing of collaboration individuals' thought is exposed to the reality of working out an appropriate response acceptable to them and to their partner. Collaborating individuals need to feel that their work practices are personally desirable while finding ways of sharing decision-making more co-equally, considering their partners' desires alongside their own. My analysis would suggest that each partner needs opportunities to build knowledge of the other's desires and aspirations and to risk sharing their own. Such spaces need to value the others' knowledge bases and avoid negative stereotypes and

assumptions that constrain partners' possibilities such as the imprisoning effect on individuals' thinking wrought by some ideas of 'professionalism'. Practitioners' experiences of the knowledge-power-liberty relation that is collaboration for them and their particular truth of that experience must be given legitimacy. Ways must be sought to differently re-think prevailing 'accountability mechanisms'. New ways must be found of seeking and valuing individual practitioners' local knowledge of new versions of collaboration that re-think, shift and reconfigure collaboration practice.

Are changes to pre and post initial professional qualification learning experiences needed to open up opportunities for individual teachers and therapists to understand their own lack of knowledge through the Other?

If there are kinds of specific knowledges required in these collaboration contexts, for example, concerning language development and disorders, then all practitioners should feel equipped with the knowledges to practise there. My analysis would suggest that practitioners working in professionally precarious, exposed and shifting contexts need new or different conceptual, critical and analytical tools to work acceptably and comfortably in that context. These new forces of power-knowledge would empower individual practitioners to construct and reconstruct different kinds of collaboration site relations, subjectivities and identities. Given new discursive tools, individuals might choose to strategically identify with or actively reconstruct contemporary versions of collaboration, rather than taking up positions of dissent, refusing previous versions because these have been experienced as undesired control at a distance and avoided as personally unacceptable.

Is there a need to reflect on forms of 'training' that are opportunities for re-thinking, that provide some ways of letting the students take risks?

Institutional acceptance and individual practitioners taking upon themselves a functioning as 'expert' or as consumers of expert knowledge or 'apprentices' has avoided new or extended professional practice but with costs to individuals in a lack of personal and professional credibility, self-worth and self-esteem. Are riskier, less controlling joint learning activities a possibility? Are experiences that provide different tools for self-formation from imposed knowledge of the subject-discipline a possibility? Would learning that neither identity positions nor work practices such as 'collaboration' are fixed or stable notions but should be interpreted and adapted in ways suited to specific collaboration sites, be an opening? Are opportunities that encourage thinking that transgresses the most recent formulations of professional-disciplinary bounds a possibility? My analysis would suggest that teacher and therapist educators and trainers should seek ways of empowering practitioners to work on their selves. They should also be encouraged to work together more equally, self-disinterestedly and legitimately in changing contexts to initiate, be represented and benefit in their specific work relationships.

How, specifically, might these suggestions be put to work?

I now provide some specific examples of ways in which my suggestions might be put to work. I am aware that I use the language of recommendation and prescription of which I was critical in chapter 4 but I am doing this in the hope that the suggested

actions, areas of responsibility and best practice will be of interest and relevance to those they concern.

Action	Area of responsibility	Best practice
Explore what teachers and therapists want to happen with collaboration	LA education service and health trust managers and leaders	Practitioners have entitlement to representation in interagency consultative fora and planning arenas.
	Teachers and therapists	Practitioners' positions, practices and concerns about collaboration matters are, as of right, voiced.
	HEIs; LA education service and health trust managers and leaders; teachers and therapists	A range of opportunities for teachers/therapists learning together locally is instituted: practitioner networks, conferences, seminars, practitioner research.
	Teachers and therapists	A will to problem solve co-practice issues together with a joint focus on the user child and family's needs is manifested.

Action	Area of responsibility	Best practice
The reconfiguration of schools to include potential collaborators from other agencies	Scottish Executive Education Department (SEED)	Government provides a national interdisciplinary forum for exploration of major issues. Government policy statements recognise the need for new and changed attitudes and for reconfigured spaces in schools, which include all practitioners.
	LA education service and health trust managers and leaders; practitioner representatives	Needs are continuously assessed and strategic plans made for change. Responsibility to consult, notify and liaise about all matters of inclusive professional practice is accepted.
	Schools' senior management; school language support provision middle managers; teaching staff in 'host' schools	External agency professionals feel that they have a rightful place in schools and that good arrangements have been made for their school-based working.

Action	Area of responsibility	Best practice
Put collaboration to work differently in future	Health and education agencies' managers; executive officers; development officers	In co-service development planning arenas, current assumptions about demarcations of practice are opened up to question.
	LA education service and health trust managers and leaders; teachers and therapists	A range of conference, workshop, practitioner network groupings of practitioners develop a culture of engagement in 'boundary work'/thinking outside the box.
	Teachers and therapists	Individuals question the 'truths' of present collaboration and take 'risks' in collaborative relationships.

Action	Area of responsibility	Best practice
Local collaboration knowledges, discourses, practices are valued	HEI providers of teacher and speech and language therapist initial professional education	Teachers and therapists learn about and jointly engage in problem solving and in versions of practitioner research.
	LA education service and health trust staff development officers; HEI and other CPD providers; teachers and therapists	Practitioner research provides individuals with new knowledge bases and more compelling voices in provision, institutional disciplinary and agency change arenas.
	Individual practitioners	Teachers and therapists generate new knowledge about their co-practice problems and questions for themselves and for their wider communities of research practice.

Action	Area of responsibility	Best practice
Introduce opportunities for collaboration during pre-service training	SEED; HEIs; teachers and therapists	Government supports undergraduate programme initiatives around learning to work together. New practitioners learn about the 'other' and engage in collaborative work pre-initial professional qualification.
	HEIs	University education/therapy departments/institutes forge new links, make possible common course architecture and shared spaces and promote joint seminars, shared workshops and other joint training events.
	HEIs; LA education service and health trusts	Support exchange school and clinical practice placements.

Action	Area of responsibility	Best practice
Introduce forms of training that are opportunities for re-thinking and risk taking	LA education service and health trust managers and leaders	A culture which accepts interprofessional experimentation is accepted and promoted.
	HEIs; other providers of teacher and therapist CPD; LA education service and health trust staff development officers	Acceptance of imaginative re-thinking of practice is depicted in training discourses, in local team development workshops and practitioner learning & teaching and research networks.
	Teachers and therapists	Individual practitioners risk day-to-day crossing of professional boundaries. Teachers and therapists feel free to work flexibly and imaginatively for their service users in their professional 'threshold' sites.

Aware that I am using the language of judgement of which I was critical in chapter 4, I would suggest that appropriate monitoring and evaluation of how these elements work out in practice is important. Perhaps the people best placed to make judgements about the success of the implementation of these actions will be the collaborators themselves.

The space for endings ... when all is said and done...

My wanderings and explorations in the site of this dissertation are perhaps ending. I am aware that the narrative that I have constructed is not 'seamless' (Atkinson (2003, 10) or a 'smooth story of the self' (to paraphrase MacLure in Atkinson, 2003, 10); rather, in my research I have experienced much 'dissonant thinking' (Bernauer, 1990, 90), multiple 'Schönberg' (ibid. 91) moments.

My grapplings with the functioning of these individuals' power relations and their collaboration subject positions are perhaps ending within the confines of this dissertation, but my now vital subversive explorations in thinking differently and constructing different ethico-political value positions go on. My entangled transgressive practices of the self in my readings, questionings, re-thinkings and re-writings will continue.

What will I take from my struggles and uncertain stumblings in this research? Perhaps, as Foucault (in Kritzman, 1988) suggests, a major kind of change occurs in:

The displacement and transformation of frameworks of thinking, the changing of received values and all the work that has been done to think otherwise, to do something else, to become other than what one is (330).

My thinking has begun to break free from the reductionist and essentializing search to pin-down 'blueprints' for 'what works'. I have, like the curate with his egg, mostly

enjoyed the experience of taking up new identities that have troubled my previous certainties and challenged my earlier conformities. How might my learning from this work open-up new possibilities? Perhaps by, as McMillan (2003) robustly suggests:

freeing things up a bit, and letting the creative juices flow...tak[ing] the trouble to listen to the dissenting voices thrown up by our society, and to understand what drives them (14).

In this research I've only just begun that energising work. When all is said and done, I am aware that there is much more to be said and done...

REFERENCES

- Allan, J. (1999) *Actively Seeking Inclusion: Pupils with special needs in mainstream schools*. London, Falmer Press.
- Alvesson, M. and Skoldberg, K. (2000) *Reflexive Methodology: New vistas for qualitative research*. London, Sage.
- Andersen, G. with Arsenault, N. (1998) *Fundamentals of Educational Research*. London, Falmer Press.
- Armstrong, F. (2003) *Spaced Out: Policy, Difference and the Challenge of Inclusive Education*. London, Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Atkinson, E. (2003) Education, postmodernism and the organisation of consent. In J. Satterthwaite, E. Atkinson and K. Gale (eds) *Discourse, power, resistance: challenging the rhetoric of contemporary education*. Stoke on Trent, Trentham.
- Baggini, J. and Fosl, P.S. (2003) *The Philosopher's Toolkit: A Compendium of Philosophical Concepts and Methods*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Ballard, K. (2002) *Discussion notes on inclusion as an issue of power*. Otago, New Zealand, University of Otago.
- Barker, P. (1998) *Michel Foucault: an introduction*. Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.
- Bastiani, J. (1989) *Working with parents: a whole-school approach*. Windsor, NFER.
- Bauman, Z. (1992) *Intimations of Postmodernity*. London, Routledge.
- Bergen, B.H. (1988) Only a schoolmaster: gender, class and the effort to

- professionalize elementary teaching in England 1870-1910. In J. Ozga (ed) *Schoolwork: approaches to the labour process of teaching*. Milton Keynes, Open University Press.
- Bernauer, J.W. (1990) *Michel Foucault's Force of Flight: Towards an Ethics for Thought*. Amherst, New York, Humanity Books.
- Bertani, M. and Fontana, A. (eds) (2003) *Michel Foucault: Society must be defended: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1975-76*. London, Allen Lane, The Penguin Press.
- Biesta, G.J.J., and Egea-Kuehne, D. (eds) (2001) *Derrida and education*. London, Routledge.
- Biggs, S. (1997) Interprofessional collaboration: problems and prospects. In J. Ovretveit, P. Mathias and T. Thompson (eds) *Interprofessional working for health and social care*. Basingstoke, Macmillan.
- Bishop, R. and Glynn, T. (1999) *Culture Counts: Changing Power Relations in Education*. Palmerston North, Dunmore Press.
- Bordo, S. (2003) The Cartesian Masculinization of Thought and the Seventeenth Century Flight from the Feminine. In L. Cahoone (ed) *From Modernism to Postmodernism*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Bouchard, D.F. (ed) (1977) *Language, counter-memory, practice: selected essays and interviews by Michel Foucault*. New York, Cornell University Press.
- Brannigan, J., Robbins, R. and Wolfreys, K. (eds) (1996) *applying: to derrida*. Basingstoke, Macmillan.
- Burgess, R.G. (ed) (1989) *The Ethics of Educational Research*. London, Falmer Press.

- Cahen, D. (2001) Derrida and the question of education. In G.J.J. Biesta and D. Egea-Kuehne (eds) *Derrida and education*. London, Routledge.
- Cahoone, L. (ed) (2003) *From Modernism to Postmodernism: An Anthology*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Coates, J. (1994) No gaps lots of overlap: turn-taking patterns in the talk of women friends. In D. Graddol, J. Maybin and B. Stierer (eds) *Researching Language and Literacy in Social Context*. Clevedon, Multilingual Matters.
- Colebatch, H.K. (1998) *Policy*. Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Colley, H. (2003) The Myth of Mentor as a Double Regime of Truth: Producing docility and devotion in engagement mentoring with 'disaffected' youth. In J. Satterthwaite, E. Atkinson and K. Gale (eds) *Discourse, Power Resistance: Challenging the Rhetoric of Contemporary Education*. Stoke on Trent, Trentham.
- Collin, A. (1998) Re-thinking the relationship between theory and practice. Practitioners as map-readers, map-makers - or jazz players? In R. Edwards, R. Harrison and A. Tait (eds) *Telling tales: Perspectives on Guidance and Counselling in Learning*. London, Routledge.
- Corbett, J. (1997) Include/exclude: redefining the boundaries. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 1.1, 55-64.
- Daines, B., Fleming, P and Miller, C. (1996) *Spotlight on special educational needs: speech and language difficulties*. Tamworth, NASEN.
- Daines, R. (1992) Crossing the divide: the relationship between teaching in class, and

- speech and language therapy programme objectives. In C. Miller (ed) *The Education System and Speech Therapy*. AFASIC Conference Proceedings. London, City University.
- Danaher, G., Schirato, T., Webb, J. (2000) *Understanding Foucault*. London, Sage.
- Denzin, N.K. (2001) The reflexive interview and a performative social science. *Qualitative Research*, 1.1, 23-46.
- Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (1998) *The Landscape of Qualitative Research*. London, Sage.
- Derrida, J. (1981a) *Positions*. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.
- Derrida, J. (1981b) *Dissemination*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Derrida, J. (2001) *Writing and Difference*. London, Routledge Classics.
- Derrida, J. (2003) "Difference". In L. Cahoone (ed) *From Modernism to Postmodernism*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Dessent, A. (1996) *Options for partnership between health, education and social services*. Tamworth, NASEN.
- Dexter, S. and La Magdeleine, D.R. (2002) Dominance Theatre, Slam-a-Thon, and Cargo Cults: Three illustrations of how using conceptual metaphors in qualitative research works. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8.3, 362-380.
- Donald, J. (1992) *Sentimental Education: Schooling, Popular Culture and the Regulation of Liberty*. London, Verso.
- Donzelot, J. (1997) *The policing of families*. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Dreyfus, H.L. and Rabinow, P. (1982) *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and*

Hermenutics. Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Dyson, A., Lin, M. and Milward, A. (1998) *Effective collaboration between schools, LEAs and the Health and Social Services in the field of Special Needs*. Sudbury, DfEE Publications.

Edwards, R., Nicoll, K. and Tait, A. (1999) Migrating metaphors: the globalization of flexibility in policy. *Journal of Education Policy*, 14.6, 619-630.

Fairclough, N. (1989) *Language and Power*. London, Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1992) *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge, Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1995) *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London, Longman.

Farmakopoulou, N. (2002) Using an integrated theoretical framework for understanding inter-agency collaboration in the special educational needs field. *European Journal of Special Educational Needs*, 17.1, 49-59.

Faubion, J.D. (ed) (2000) *Michel Foucault: aesthetics: essential works of Foucault 1954-1984: Volume 2*. London, Penguin Books.

Fearn, N. (2001) *Zeno and the tortoise: how to think like a philosopher*. London, Atlantic Books.

Fleming, P., Miller, C. and Wright, J. (1997) *Speech and language difficulties in education: approaches to collaborative practice for teachers and speech and language therapists*. Bicester, Winslow Press.

Forbes, J. and Welbon, H. (2001) Teacher/therapist collaboration: a Scottish higher education institution development. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 36. Suppl., 417-422.

Foucault, M. (1972) *The Archeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*.

New York, Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1973) *The Birth of the Clinic: An Archaeology of Medical Perception*.

New York, Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1977) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London, Penguin

Books.

Foucault, M. (1978) Politics and the study of discourse. *Ideology and consciousness*, 3.

Spring, 7-26.

Foucault, M. (1985) *The Use of Pleasure: The History of Sexuality: 2*. London, Penguin

Books.

Foucault, M. (1986) *The Care of the Self: The History of Sexuality: 3*. London,

Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (1998) *The Will to Knowledge*. London, Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (2000a) *The Birth of the Clinic*. London, Routledge.

Foucault, M. (2000b) *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*.

London, Routledge.

Foucault, M. (2000c) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London, Routledge.

Foucault, M. (2003) From Truth and Power. In L. Cahoone (ed) *From Modernism to*

Postmodernism. Oxford, Blackwell.

Friend, M. and Cook, L. (2000) *Interactions: collaboration skills for school*

professionals. New York, Addison, Wesley, Longman.

Gale, K. (2003) Creative Pedagogies of Resistance in Post Compulsory (teacher)

- Education. In J. Satterthwaite, E. Atkinson and K. Gale (eds) *Discourse, power, resistance: challenging the rhetoric of contemporary education*. Stoke on Trent, Trentham.
- Gitlin, A. Siegel, M. and Boru, K. (1993) The Politics of Method: from leftist ethnography to educative research. In M. Hammersley (ed) *Educational Research: Current Issues*. London, Paul Chapman.
- Goldstein, L.S. (2002) Moving beyond collaboration: re-describing research relationships with classroom teachers. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice*, 8.2, 155-170.
- Gordon, C. (ed) (1980) *Michel Foucault: power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings 1972-1977 by Michel Foucault*. Harlow, Longman.
- Hall, D. (2003) From 'Modern China and the Postmodern West'. In L. Cahoone (ed) *From Modernism to Postmodernism*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Halliday, M.A.K. (1978) *Language as social semiotic*. London, Edward Arnold.
- Harrison, R., Edwards, R. and Brown, J. (2001) Crash test dummies or knowledgeable practitioners? Evaluating the impact of professional development. *British Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 29.2, 199-211.
- Harrison, R., Clarke, J., Edwards, R. and Reeve, F. (2003) Power and Resistance in Further Education: The discursive work of negotiating identities. In J. Satterthwaite, E. Atkinson, and K. Gale (eds) *Discourse, power, resistance: challenging the rhetoric of contemporary education*. Stoke on Trent, Trentham.
- Hassan, I. (1987) *The postmodern turn: Essays in postmodern theory and culture*. Columbus, Ohio State University Press.

- HM Inspectorate of Education (2002) *Count us in: Achieving Inclusion in Scottish Schools*. Edinburgh. HMSO.
- HM Inspectors of Schools (1994) *Effective Provision for Special Educational Needs*. Edinburgh, HMSO.
- HM Inspectors of Schools (1996) *The Education of Pupils with Language and Communication Disorders*. Edinburgh, HMSO.
- Hornby, S. and Atkins, J. (1993) *Collaborative Care: Interprofessional, Interagency and Interpersonal*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Hursh, D. (2003) Discourse, power and resistance in New York: The rise of testing and accountability and the decline of teacher professionalism and local control. In J. Satterthwaite, E. Atkinson and K. Gale (eds) *Discourse, power, resistance: changing the rhetoric of contemporary education*. Stoke on Trent, Trentham.
- I CAN (2001) *Joint Professional Development Framework: for all teachers and speech and language therapists working with children with speech, language and communication needs*. London, I CAN.
- Irigaray, L. (2003) The Sex Which Is Not One. In L. Cahoon (ed) *From Modernism to Postmodernism*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Kersner, M. (1996) Working Together for Children with Severe Learning Disabilities. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 12, 17-28.
- Kersner, M. and Wright, J.A. (1996) A collaboration between teachers and speech and language therapists working with children with severe learning difficulties (SLD): implications for professional development. *British Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 24.1, 33-37.

- Kress, G. and Hodge, R. (1979) *Language as Ideology*. London, Routledge.
- Kritzman, L.D. (ed) (1988) *Michel Foucault: Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writings 1977-1984*. London, Routledge.
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980) *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.
- Lather, P. (1986a) Research as praxis. *Harvard Educational Review*, 56.3, 257-277.
- Lather, P. (1986b) Issues of Validity in Openly Ideological Research: Between a Rock and a Soft Place. *Interchange*, 17.4, 63-74.
- Lather, P. (1991) *Getting Smart: Feminist Research and Pedagogy with/in the Postmodern*. London, Routledge.
- Lather, P. (1992) Critical Frames in Educational Research: Feminist and Post-structural perspectives. *Theory into Practice*, 31.2, 87-99.
- Lather, P. (1993) Fertile Obsession: Validity after Post-Structuralism. *Sociological Quarterly*, 35, 673-693.
- Lather, P. (1996) Troubling Clarity: The Politics of Accessible Language. *Harvard Educational Review*, 66.3, 525-545.
- Lather, P. (1997) A Shorter Letter: Coreadings, Misreadings and Rereadings. *Harvard Educational Review*, 67.3, 590-595.
- Law, J., Lindsay, G., Peacey, N., Gascoigne, M., Soloff, N., Radford, J., Band, S. and Fitzgerald, L. (2000) *Provision for children with speech and language needs in England and Wales: facilitating communication between education and health services*. Nottingham, DfEE Publications.
- Law, J., Lindsay, G., Peacey, N., Gascoigne, M., Soloff, N., Radford, J. and Band, S.

- (2001) Facilitating communication between education and health services: the provision for children with speech and language needs. *British Journal of Special Education*, 28.3, 133-137.
- Lawn, M. and Ozga, J. (1988) The educational worker? A reassessment of teachers. In J. Ozga (ed) *Schoolwork: approaches to the labour process of teaching*. Milton Keynes, Open University Press.
- Leathard, A. (2000) *Going Inter-Professional: Working Together for Health and Welfare*. Hove, Brunner-Routledge.
- Lechte, J. (1994) *Fifty Key Contemporary Thinkers: from structuralism to postmodernity*. London, Routledge.
- Levinas, E. (2003) "Meaning and Sense". In L. Cahoon (ed) *From Modernism to Postmodernism*. Oxford, Blackwell.
- Loxley, A. (1997) *Collaboration in Health and Welfare: Working with Difference*. London, Jessica Kingsley.
- Luscombe, M. and Shaw, L. (1996) Agreeing priorities for a school service. *Bulletin, Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists*, 536, 8-9.
- Lyotard, J.F. (1984) *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.
- MacKay, G., McCartney, E., McCool, S. and Cheseldine, S. (1995) Our little system has its day: a proposal for design in evaluations. In R. Stark and A. Roger (eds) *Proceedings of the Scottish Educational Research Association*. University of Strathclyde, SERA.
- MacLure, M. (1994) Language and Discourse: the embrace of uncertainty. *British*

Journal of Sociology of Education, 15.2, 283-300.

MacLure, M. (1996) Exploring the transitions: boundary work in the lives of teacher-researchers. *British Educational Research Journal*, 22.3, 273-286.

MacLure, M. (2003) *Discourse in Educational and Social Research*. Buckingham, Open University Press.

Martin, D. and Millar, C. (1996) *Speech and Language Difficulties in the Classroom*. London, David Fulton.

Martin, D. and Millar, C. (1998) *Language and the Curriculum: Practitioner Research in Planning Differentiation*. London, David Fulton.

Mathiás, P. and Thompson, T. (1997) Preparation for interprofessional work: trends in education, training and the structure of qualifications in the United Kingdom. In J. Ovretveit, P. Mathias and T. Thompson (eds) *Interprofessional Working for Health and Social Care*. Basingstoke, Macmillan.

Mathias, P., Prime, R. and Thompson, T. (1997) Preparation for interprofessional work: holism, integration and the purpose of education and training. In J. Ovreveit, P. Mathias and T. Thompson (eds) *Interprofessional Working for Health and Social Care*. Basingstoke, Macmillan.

McCartney, E. and van der Gaag, A. (1996) How shall we be judged? Speech and Language Therapists in Educational Settings. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 12.3, 314-327.

McCartney, E., MacKay, G., Cheseldine, S. and McCool, S. (1998) The development of a systems analysis approach to small-scale educational evaluation. *Educational Review*, 50, 65-73.

- McCartney, E. (ed) (1999a) *Speech/Language Therapists and Teachers Working Together: A Systems Approach to Collaboration*. London, Whurr.
- McCartney, E. (1999b) Barriers to collaboration: an analysis of systemic barriers to collaboration between teachers and speech and language therapists. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*, 34.4, 431-440.
- McConkey, R. (2001) Unpublished Keynote Presentation: Joined-up Working Conference. *National Training Co-ordination Project Conference*. Edinburgh, SEED.
- McConkey, R. (2002) Reciprocal working by education, health and social services: lessons for a less-travelled road. *British Journal of Special Education*, 29.1, 3-8.
- McMillan, J. (2003) The stifling pressure to conform is killing all creativity. In *The Scotsman Newspaper*, Saturday 10th May. Edinburgh, Scotsman Publications.
- Millar, S. and Reid, J. (1996) The Role of SLTs in Education. *Bulletin, Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists*, Nov. 12-13.
- Miller, C. (ed) (1992) *The Education System and Speech Therapy*. AFASIC Conference Proceedings. London, City University.
- Miller, C. (1996) Relationships between teachers and speech-language therapists: influencing practice by distance education. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 12.1, 29-38.
- Mills, S. (1997) *Discourse*. London, Routledge.
- New, E. (1998) An effective model for a speech and language therapy service in

- mainstream schools. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*. Suppl., 602-607.
- Newman, S. (1996) Working both sides of the fence: the effect of a dual qualification on collaborative working practice. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 12, 39-47.
- Nicoll, K. and Edwards, R. (2000) Reading policy texts: lifelong learning as metaphor. *International Journal of Lifelong Learning*, 19.5, 459-469.
- Nichols, S. (2003) 'They just won't critique anything': The 'problem' of international students in the Western academy. In J. Satterthwaite, E. Atkinson and K. Gale (eds) *Discourse, power, resistance: challenging the rhetoric of contemporary education*. Stoke on Trent, Trentham.
- Nixon, J., Martin, J., McKeown, P. and Ranson, S. (1997) Towards a Learning Profession: changing codes of occupational practice within the new management of education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 18.1, 5-28.
- Novak, P. (2001) *The Vision of Nietzsche*. London, Vega.
- Ovretveit, J. (1997a) How to describe interprofessional working. In J. Ovretveit, P. Mathias and T. Thompson (eds) *Interprofessional Working for Health and Social Care*. Basingstoke, Macmillan.
- Ovretveit, J. (1997b) Planning and managing interprofessional working and teams. In J. Ovretveit, P. Mathias and T. Thompson (eds) *Interprofessional Working for Health and Social Care*. Basingstoke, Macmillan.
- Ovretveit, J. (1997c) Evaluating interprofessional working - a case example of a

- community mental health team. In J. Ovretveit, P. Mathias and T. Thompson (eds) *Interprofessional Working for Health and Social Care*. Basingstoke, Macmillan.
- Ovretveit, J. (1997d) How patient power and client participation affects relations between professions. In J. Ovretveit, P. Mathias and T. Thompson (eds) *Interprofessional Working for Health and Social Care*. Basingstoke, Macmillan.
- Ozga, J. (2000) *Policy research in educational settings: contested terrain*. Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Paley, J. (2001) An archaeology of caring knowledge. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 36.2, 188-198.
- Paley, John (2002) JAN Forum: your views and letters. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 39.1, 103-105.
- Paradice, R. (2002) Learning to collaborate: What do parents think of joint training for teachers and therapists working with children with language difficulties? *Bulletin, Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists*, 597, 4-5.
- Paradice, R. and Adewusi, A. (2002) 'It's a continuous fight isn't it?': Parents views of the educational provision for children with speech and language difficulties. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*, 18.3, 257-288.
- Parker, S. (1997) *Reflective Teaching in the Postmodern world: a manifesto for education in postmodernity*. Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Potter, J. (1996) *Representing reality: Discourse, Rhetoric and Social Construction*. London, Sage.
- Potter, J. and Wetherell, M. (1987) *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes*

and Behaviour. London, Sage.

Powell, J. (1997) *Derrida for Beginners*. London, Writers and Readers Ltd.

Quinn, J. (2003) *Powerful subjects: are women really taking over the university?* Stoke on Trent, Trentham.

Rabinow, P. (ed) (1984) *The Foucault Reader: an introduction to Foucault's thought*. London, Penguin Books.

Rabinow, P. (ed) (2000) *Michel Foucault: ethics: essential works of Foucault 1954-84: Volume 1*. London, Penguin Books.

Rajchman, J. (1985) *Michel Foucault: The Freedom of Philosophy*. New York, Columbia University Press.

Reid, J., Millar, S., Tait, L, Donaldson, M.L., Dean, E.C., Thomson, G.O.B. and Grieve, R. (1996) *The Role of the Speech and Language Therapist in the Education of Pupils with Special Educational Needs*. Edinburgh, University of Edinburgh.

Reid, J. and Farmer, H. (2001) *How good is our collaboration? Working practice agreements between schools and speech & language therapists*. Fife, Fife Council.

Rorty, R. (ed) (1967) *The Linguistic Turn: Recent Essays in Philosophical Method*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Royal College of Speech and Language Therapists (1996) *Communicating Quality 2: professional standards for speech and language therapists*. London, RCSLT.

Satterthwaite, J. (2003) *The Terror! The Terror! Speaking the Literal to Inspire the*

- Understanding of a Friend. In J. Satterthwaite, E. Atkinson and K. Gale (eds) *Discourse, power, resistance: challenging the rhetoric of contemporary education*. Stoke on Trent, Trentham.
- Scheurich, J.J. (1997) *Research Method in the Postmodern*. London, Falmer.
- Schön, D. (1978) *Educating the Reflective Practitioner*. San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.
- Scott, D. and Usher, R. (eds) (1996) *Understanding Educational Research*. London, Routledge.
- Scottish Consultative Council on the Curriculum (SCCC) (1999) *Support for Learning, Part 3 No 7, Developing the 5-14 Curriculum for Pupils with Language and Communication Disorders*. Dundee, SCCC.
- Scottish Executive Education Department (SEED) (1999) *Raising Standards, Setting Targets Support Pack: Special Educational Needs*. Edinburgh, SEED.
- Scottish Executive Education Department (SEED) (2000) *Success for all: Target Setting Within Individualised Educational Programmes*. Northern College, SEED.
- Scottish Office Education and Industry Department (SOEID) (1996a) *How Good is Our School? Self-evaluation using performance indicators*. Edinburgh, SOEID.
- Scottish Office Education and Industry Department (SOEID) (1996b) *Interchange 43, Pupils with Special Educational Needs: The Role of Speech and Language Therapists*. Edinburgh, SOEID.
- Scottish Office Education and Industry Department (SOEID) (1998) *A Manual of Good Practice in Special Educational Needs*. Edinburgh, SOEID.
- Shaw, K.E. (1988) Rationality, experience and theory. In A Westoby (ed) *Culture and*

- Power in Educational Organizations*. Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Shumway, D. (1989) *Michel Foucault*. Charlottesville, University Press of Virginia.
- Simons, J. (1995) *Foucault & the political*. London, Routledge.
- Sinclair, J. McH. and Coulthard, M. (1975) *Towards an Analysis of Discourse*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- St Pierre, E.A. and Pillow, W.S. (2000) *Working the ruins: Feminist poststructural theory and methods in education*. London, Routledge.
- Stronach, I. and Maclure, M. (1997) *Educational Research Undone: The Postmodern Embrace*. Buckingham, Open University Press.
- Swain, J. (1995) Constructing participatory research: in principle and in practice. In P. Clough and L. Barton (eds) *Making Difficulties: Research and the Construction of SEN*. London, Paul Chapman.
- Usher, R. (1996) Textuality and reflexivity in educational research. In D. Scott and R. Usher (eds) *Understanding Educational Research*. London, Routledge.
- Usher, R. and Edwards, R. (1994) *Postmodernism and education*. London, Routledge.
- van der Gaag, A. (1995) *Efficacy of speech and language therapy services for people with learning disabilities*. Paper presented at the RCSLT Jubilee Conference, York.
- Ward, G. (1997) *Postmodernism*. London, Hodder Headline.
- Weinstein, J. (1997) The development of shared learning: conspiracy or constructive development? In J. Ovretveit, P. Mathias and T. Thompson (eds) *Interprofessional Working for Health and Social Care*. Basingstoke, Macmillan.
- West, C. (2003) A Genealogy of Modern Racism. In L. Cahoone (ed) *From*

Modernism to Postmodernism. Oxford, Blackwell.

Wolfeys, J. (ed) (1998) *The Derrida Reader: writing performances*. Edinburgh,
Edinburgh University Press.

Wright, J.A. (1996) Teachers and Therapists: the evolution of a partnership. *Child
Language Teaching and Therapy*, 12.1, 3-16.

Wright, J.A. and Graham, J. (1997) Where and when do speech and language therapists
work with teachers? *British Journal of Special Education*, 24.4, 171-174.

Zurbrugg, N. (1993) *The Parameters of Postmodernism*. London, Routledge.